PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
SERIES IN ROMANIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
NO. 11

THE LIFE AND DRAMATIC WORKS OF GERTRUDIS GÓMEZ DE AVELLANEDA

EDWIN BUCHER WILLIAMS

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PHILADELPHIA
1924

THE LIFE AND DRAMATIC WORKS OF GERTRUDIS GÓMEZ DE AVELLANEDA

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

EDWIN BUCHER WILLIAMS

PHILADELPHIA

1924

PUBLICATIONS OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

DEPARTMENT OF
ROMANIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
NO. 11

PREFACE

In the case of Señora Avellaneda there is an unusually close relationship between life and work, and it was seen at the outset that an adequate study of the plays could not be accomplished without considering certain events of the dramatist's life and certain peculiarities of her personality.

Existing biographies were found to be so insufficient and to contain so many mutual contradictions that it became necessary to sift them all, and to compare and supplement the resulting conclusions with all the published documents of an autobiographical nature.

The plays have been studied, first, with the object of determining their sources in historical material or in earlier dramatic literature; second, in order to trace the influence of contemporaneous dramatic *genres;* third, to analyse the development of the author's esthetic ideals as evidenced by later revisions; and fourth, to ascertain what elements might be directly related to known factors in her life.

The author wishes to express his thanks to Prof. J. P. W. Crawford for suggesting the subject and most of the special problems, and for much subsequent advice and assistance; to Prof. Hugo A. Rennert, Prof. Jean B. Beck, Prof. Albert F. Hurlburt and Dr. David Rubio for reading the manuscript and making many useful suggestions; to Prof. Miguel Romera-Navarro for valuable material secured at the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, and to Prof. Emile Malakis for carefully reading the proofs.

E. B. W.

TO MY
MOTHER

CONTENTS

Introduction—Spanish Romanticism 7

I

The Life of Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda 19

II

Tragedies and Dramas 35

III

Comedies 95

IV

Versification of the Plays—Conclusion 110

Bibliography 114

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41542728_0030

INTRODUCTION

SPANISH ROMANTICISM

In spite of the ascendency of the doctrines of Boileau in Spain, poets were not lacking in the eighteenth century who, partly out of nationalistic sentiment and partly out of sound literary convictions, defended the masters of the *Siglo de Oro* and followed in their footsteps. In the first half of the century the most noteworthy imitators of Lope de Vega were José Cañizares and Antonio de Zamora; and Lope's poetics were stoutly upheld in the criticism of Padre Feijóo. Later on, plays in the same manner were produced by Comella, Moncín, Valladares, Zavala y Zamora and Ramón de la Cruz. All these writers found favor with the people, but Ramón de la Cruz was the only one who brought forth works of merit; from 1765 to the end of the century his plays furnished amusement to all classes in Madrid.[1]

While the followers of the traditional drama were enjoying such popularity, the pseudo-classicists were meeting with little success; they were trying to impose a foreign and an artificial system which they could not follow in practice. The most they did was to discredit the work of the *Siglo de Oro* in cultured and in learned circles. Thus we see that the manner of romanticism was autochthonous in Spain, and a further development of the old school was only delayed by a lack of the proper sanctions. With a great deal of truth does Azorín exclaim, "El imperio de las reglas era ilusorio en España."[2]

At the beginning of the nineteenth century a great German critic, August Wilhelm von Schlegel, condemned the doctrines of Boileau and pointed to the works of Calderón as standards of the highest excellency. The theories of Schlegel were brought to Spain by Nicolás Böhl de Faber, a German who was appointed

[1] Cf. Alfred Gassier, *Le Théâtre Espagnol*, Paris, 1898, p. 219.
[2] Azorín, *Rivas y Larra, Razón social del romanticismo en España*, Madrid, 1921, p. 14.

consul at Cadiz. In the *Mercurio Gaditano* of September 16, 1814, and later in the *Minerva* of February 26, 1818, under the title of *Reflexiones sobre el teatro*, he published extracts of Schlegel's course on dramatic literature, the theories of which were attacked in the *Crónica científica y literaria* of Madrid (1817–1820) by the celebrated classicist José Joaquín de Mora. There was a long polemic and Böhl in support of his arguments had several of the dramas of Calderón presented on the stage at Cadiz. From 1810 to 1834 Böhl carried on a correspondence with the Hamburg physician, Nikolaus Heinrich Julius; this correspondence reveals Böhl's interest in the things of the past and his constantendeavor to increase his stock of rare editions; withthese he was able to compile his *Floresta de rimas antiguas castellanas* and his *Teatro español anterior a Lope de Vega*.[3] He was the father of Cecilia Böhl de Faber known in Spanish literature as Fernán Caballero.

Schlegel's influence was only the first of a series of foreign and domestic causes that contributed to the rise of romanticism in Spain. Events of a purely political nature had contributed to the re-awakening of interest in national tradition. The literary tyranny of Boileau had been supplemented by a political tyranny destined to be suffered with far less patience. As a result of the invasion and occupation by the armies of Napoleon from 1808 to 1813, a new awakening of patriotic and nationalistic spirit developed. This spirit is represented in literature by the patriotic poetry of Gallego and Quintana. The latter, although a classicist, pointed the way to many new developments, and therefore, has been aptly called "le véritable trait d'union"[4] between the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries.

The repressive acts of the Restoration drove most of the young men of letters into exile. Nevertheless, the few who remained at home, often with the collaboration of foreigners, continued the spreading of romantic ideas. In 1828 Agustín Durán published in Madrid a *Discurso sobre el influjo que ha tenido la crítica moderna en la decadencia del teatro antiguo español*,

---

[3] Cf. C. Pitollet, *Les premiers essais littéraires de Fernán Caballero, Bulletin Hispanique*, Vol. IX, 1907, p. 71.

[4] E. Mérimée, *Les poésies lyriques de Quintana, Bulletin Hispanique*, Vol. IV, 1902, p. 120.

y sobre el modo con que debe ser considerado para juzgar convenientemente de su mérito peculiar.[5] Durán is naturally hostile to pseudo-classicism, but the romanticism with which he would replace it, is not to be inspired by foreign sources; its inspiration is to be the *Siglo de Oro* and the ballads of Old Spain. This is the ideal conception of Spanish romanticism, the conception of Böhl de Faber. But influences were at work which were destined to interfere seriously with the realization of this ideal. The theaters were flooded with translations of foreign authors: first, Shakespeare, Schiller, Lessing, Kotzebue, Arnault, Lemercier, Legouvé and Ducis; later, Picard, Scribe, Duval and Ducange held the boards. Much of this work was done by members of the *Parnasillo*, a literary gathering which arose in 1830 in the gloomy Café del Príncipe.[6] At the same time the Italian opera was winning great favor. In 1834 Larra finds all of the following *genres* on the Spanish stage—the *comedia antigua*, the melodrama and the sentimental drama imported from the Porte Saint-Martin, the classical comedy of Molière and Moratín, the classical tragedy sometimes in translation, sometimes original, the comedy of manners of Scribe, the historical drama and the romantic drama.[7]

Besides, the exiles who had gone to Paris came under the immediate influence of French romanticism. In 1827, Hugo published his *Préface de Cromwell;* in 1829, Dumas' *Henri III et sa Cour* was favorably received, and in February, 1830, the success of *Hernani* definitely established the triumph of romanticism in France. Spain did not have a July Revolution, and the reign of Ferdinand VII was only ended by his death, three years later than the fall of Charles X. Ferdinand's reactionary measures had been far more prejudicial to literary development than anything done by the Bourbons in France. But now, with the sudden return of the *emigrados*, instead of the *Art*

---

[5] Narciso Alonso Cortés says, "Este discurso de Durán es para España lo que las *Lecciones* de Schlegel para Alemania, la *Carta sobre las tres unidades* de Manzoni, para Italia, y el prefacio de *Cromwell*, de Hugo, para Francia." Narciso Alonso Cortés, *Zorrilla, su vida y sus obras*, Valladolid, 1916, Vol. I, p. 144.

[6] The interesting story of the *Parnasillo* is told by Mesonero Romanos in *Memorias de un setentón*, Madrid, 1880; Chapter XXI.

[7] *Obras completas de Fígaro, nueva edición*, Paris, 1913, Vol. 2, pp. 334–335.

Poétique of Boileau, another French growth, the French romantic drama began to flower on Spanish soil. This new drama is pervaded by a strange and dismal atmosphere, the weirdness of which is effected by scenes of ruins, cemeteries, gallows, dungeons, tombs, etc., in which we hear the clanking of chains, the voices of witches, and the piteous groans of the tortured. Many plays of Dumas and Hugo were translated into Spanish: Escosura translated *Catherine Howard;* García Gutiérrez translated *la Tour de Nesle* under the title of *Margarita de Borgoña;* Ochoa translated *Antony* and *Hernani;* Hartzenbusch translated *Angèle* under the title of *Ernesto*, etc. The first original Spanish play with romantic tendencies was Martínez de la Rosa's *La conjuración de Venecia* (April 22, 1834). On September 24th of the same year Larra brought forth a much more definitely romantic drama, *Macías*, and a month later (October 23d) Bretón's only romantic play, *Elena*, was first produced. On the 22d of March, 1835, the Duque de Rivas' *Don Álvaro o la fuerza del sino* was first played; this play was far more revolutionary than any of the above-mentioned Spanish plays and its first performance has often been compared with the first presentation of *Hernani*. Toward the end of the same year Pacheco's *Alfredo* was produced. On the 1st of March of the following year *El Trovador* won lasting fame for García Gutiérrez. It was in 1836 that Martínez de la Rosa's Spanish translation of his *Aben Humeya* failed. This historical drama was originally written in French and played July 19, 1830, at the Porte Saint-Martin where it had a successful run of two months. José María Díaz's *Elvira de Albornoz* was also played in 1836. The year 1837 saw the climax of the romantic drama. The greatest play of this year and one of the greatest plays of the whole period was Juan Eugenio Hartzenbusch's *Los amantes de Teruel*. Other romantic plays first produced during 1837 were: Escosura's *La corte del Buen Retiro* and *Bárbara Blomberg*, Roca de Togores' *Doña María de Molina*, Castro y Orozco's *Fray Luis de León*, García Gutiérrez's *El Paje* and *El Rey Monje*, and Gil y Zárate's *Carlos II el Hechizado*. After 1837 the distinctly French phase of the Spanish romantic drama soon came to an end. Although many mild imitations followed, *Los amantes de Teruel* was the

last triumph. The romanticism that continued was a nationalistic movement. Less than a month after the first representation of *Los amantes de Teruel*, January 19, 1837, at the funeral of Larra, February 14, 1837, which is described by Mesonero as "el primer homenaje público, acaso desde Lope de Vega, rendido entre nosotros al ingenio,"[8] Spain came to know and to admire for the first time the greatest nationalistic poet of Spanish romanticism, José Zorrilla. At the same time a reaction began to set in; a compromise was being effected; the cause was probably the tendency toward realism which was slowly but surely manifesting itself in the literatures of all countries and which was naturally turning the stage back to the sober standards of classicism. In France this attempt at a return to classicism is seen in Ponsard's tragedy, *Lucrèce* (1843); in Spain it is first to be noticed in the early plays of Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda (1844–1845).

The romantic novel developed from two distinct sources, the historical novel of Walter Scott, and the French romantic novel. The Spanish historical novel, less violent and spectacular at its appearance, and less French in its antecedents than the drama, was more readily adapted to Spanish traditions. Its fundamental source was Scott, in the original and in French translations, and it was largely through the exiled groups in London and Paris that this influence penetrated into Spain.[9] In 1830 the printer, Federico Moreno, began to publish a *Nueva colección de novelas de Sir Walter Scott, traducidas por una sociedad de literatos*. Then came a countless number of imitations the quality of which was very poor.[10] The first were written in English by Telesforo Trueba y Cosío, who lived in London; the very first one was *Gomez Arias* (1828); it was translated into Spanish in 1831 by Mariano Torrente. In 1829 Trueba y Cosío wrote *The Castilian or the Black Prince in Spain*,

---

[8] Mesonero Romanos, *op. cit.*, p. 435.

[9] Cf. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Lecciones de literatura española*, Madrid, 1910, p. 291.

[10] Cf. Enrique Piñeyro, *El Romanticismo en España*, Paris, 1904, *Introducción*, p. VIII: "La novela misma, que tanto prosperó en otros países, que tanto renovó y engrandeció el dominio de la prosa, en manos de artistas tan originales y eminentes como Scott, como Balzac, como Victor Hugo, como Manzoni, como Mérimée, no logró crear en España más que pálidas imitaciones de las obras del novelista escocés."

the Spanish version of which (1845) was based on a French translation. The first imitation of Scott written originally in Spanish was *Los Bandos de Castilla o el Caballero del Cisne* (1830) of Ramón López Soler, one of the founders of *El Europeo* (1823), and at the time of the publication of his novel, a collaborator in the work of the printer Cabrerizo. In an article in the *Gaceta* of December 11, 1830, it is explained that Soler wished to apply the method of Scott in the treatment of a Spanish subject.[11] But he did not do this without incorporating a free version of Byron's *Giaour* into his novel.[12]

In an article in the *Estrella* of December 3, 1833, Scott was called the Cervantes of Scotland[13]; this gives some idea of the high esteem in which he was held by Spaniards. The Duque de Rivas in his inaugural speech in the Spanish Academy, October 29, 1834, attributes to Scott, Byron and Hugo the renewed interest in national literature. In 1834 Larra tried his hand at the new *genre* in *El Doncel de D. Enrique el Doliente*, and in the same year Espronceda published his *Sancho Saldaña o El castellano de Cuellar*. In 1835 appeared Escosura's *Ni rey ni roque, episodio histórico del reinado de Felipe II*, and García de Villalta's *Golpe en vago* which is said to have been first written in English under the title of *The Dons of the Last Century*.[14] *Doña Isabel de Solís, Reyna de Granada* (in three installments—1837, 1839, and 1846), of Martínez de la Rosa is interesting as an effort of the author in this *genre*, but not for any intrinsic merit.[15] The only noteworthy imitation of Scott was Enrique Gil y Carrasco's *El Señor de Bembibre* (1844) which González-Blanco calls "la más bella novela de la época romántica."[16] But González-Blanco's superlative has little value when one considers the inferiority of the other elements of the comparison. Churchman and Peers hold to the opinion that *El Señor de*

[11] Quoted by Philip H. Churchman and E. Allison Peers in *A Survey of the Influence of Sir Walter Scott in Spain, Revue Hispanique*, Vol. LV, New York and Paris, 1922, p. 242.

[12] E. Allison Peers, *Sidelights on Byronism in Spain, Revue Hispanique*, Vol. L, 1920, p. 362.

[13] Quoted by Philip H. Churchman and E. Allison Peers, in *op. cit.*, p. 23.

[14] Cf. Philip H. Churchman and E. Allison Peers, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[15] Cf. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Estudios de crítica literaria*, Series 1, p. 287; Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Historia de la literatura española*, Madrid, 1921, p. 306; Blanco García, *La literatura española en el siglo XIX*, Madrid, 1891–1894, *parte primera*, p. 365.

[16] Andres González-Blanco, *Historia de la novela en España*, p. 98. This is also the opinion of Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

Bembibre is an imitation of Scott's *Bride of Lammermoor*, contrary to the opinion of Vera e Isla, Piñeyro and González-Blanco.[17] Why, after all, was this *genre* so fruitless? Possibly because Spaniards have always been used to telling in verse the exploits of their national heroes. And so, it is in verse, in the *romances* of the Duque de Rivas and of José Zorrilla, that we find the legends of Old Spain revived in worthy fashion.[18]

The influence of the French romantic novel produced more numerous although even less important imitations than the influence of Scott. Beginning in 1818 with Mariano Cabrerizo's collection of translations of mediocre pre-romantic French novels, this influence continued long past the middle of the century. The pace was set by Sue, Dumas, George Sand, Paul de Kock, etc.; translations and imitations were legion but nothing was produced that is even remembered today, with the possible exception of the works of M. Fernández y González.

During the first quarter of the nineteenth century, pseudo-classicism continued to prevail in Spanish poetry. Throughout this period the tradition of the eighteenth century was sustained by the *Academia de Letras Humanas* founded in Seville in 1793. As late as 1827 Martínez de la Rosa published his *Poética* which adhered faithfully to the doctrines of Luzán. The greatest poet of those times was Quintana, and his patriotic odes against Napoleon furnish a new theme in the poetry of the epoch. But Quintana was a classicist and a disciple of the political and social theories of eighteenth century French rationalism; he did not grasp the spirit of the new age. This was a spirit of melancholy and pessimism which spread all over the civilized world.[19] And yet, everybody felt it a distinction to suffer from

---

[17] Cf. Philip H. Churchman and E. Allison Peers, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

[18] Contemporary and later critics have thought that the *Moro Expósito* was inspired by Scott. Cf. Churchman and Peers, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, 27.

[19] Cf. George Brandes, *Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature*, London, 1902, Vol. 1, p. 32: "The melancholy of the early nineteenth century partakes of the nature of a disease; and it is not a disease which attacks a single individual or a single nation only, it is an epidemic which spreads from people to people, in the manner of those religious manias which so often spread over Europe in the Middle Ages. . . . This melancholy and this misanthropy differ from any previously known. Molière's Alceste, for instance, . . . is only misanthropical in so far that he is troubled to the depths of his being by the meanness, the servility, the frivolous or cowardly duplicity which prevail at a corrupt or worldly court; he is not melancholy, there is nothing morbid in his temperament, he does not bear the mark of Cain upon his brow."

the *mal du siècle;* this individualistic phase of the new mood found its natural expression in lyric poetry, so much so that all other *genres* are pervaded by a lyric strain.

How this new spirit arose and spread over the fertile soil of disillusioned France and bewildered Spain is a story we shall not attempt to tell. How it prospered in Spain we can judge by the poetry it inspired, a poetry "escéptica, falta de fe, desnuda de esperanza y rica de desengaño y de dolores, que más bien desgarra el corazón que lo conmueve."[20] Bonilla y San Martín in his article *El Pensamiento de Espronceda*[21] analyzes as follows the gloomy philosophy of romanticism: all thought leads to doubt; the only thing that is real is sorrow; pleasure is an illusion, and death is the rational solution of life's problems. And the following lines of Cañete are a typical example of the lyrical expression of this philosophy:

> ¡Mísera condición la del humano!
> Mirar el mundo de hermosuras lleno,
> Beber la copa del placer ufano,
> Y hallar tan sólo matador veneno.[22]

Spain's greatest romantic lyricist was Espronceda. He has been called the Spanish Byron. There is some truth in the appellation, but although Espronceda took much from Byron, what he took he made his own, and if it was not lyrical, he was sure to make it so. Of a gentler strain is the melancholy of Enrique Gil y Carrasco, who might be called the Spanish Musset, if he but had the touch of humor.[23] The *culte du moi* found no greater exponent in Spain than Nicomedes Pastor Díaz, whose gloomy pessimism is only counterbalanced by a deep-rooted religious faith. Christian faith was the common solution for pessimism in Spain[24]; and many of her romantic poets on shrinking from reality, found refuge in religion.

---

[20] Enrique Gil y Carrasco in *Semanario Pintoresco* of July 19, 1840.

[21] In *La España Moderna*, Vol. CCXXXIV.

[22] From poem *El Otoño* in review *La Alhambra*, Vol. 11, pp. 237, 238, quoted by E. Allison Peers, *Some Provincial Periodicals in Spain During the Romantic Movement*, in *Modern Language Review*, Vol. 15, 1920, p. 386.

[23] Cf. Andres González-Blanco, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

[24] Cf. E. Allison Peers, *op. cit.*, pp. 389, 390.

It is by studying the criticism of the romantic period in Spain as revealed in periodicals, essays and prefaces that we can best arrive at a definition of the various phases of the movement.

The idea that Spanish romanticism was simply to be a return to the manner of the *Siglo de Oro* was the gist of the teaching introduced by Böhl de Faber[25] and later elaborated by Agustín Durán.[26] And this teaching was, indeed, the corner-stone of almost all the criticism of the epoch.[27] Spanish romantic criticism had many points in common with the theories of French romanticism, but as the influence of French romanticism increased in Spain, the teaching of Böhl and of Durán, because of its nationalistic principles, became the basis of antagonism to many of the French theories. And as these theories usurped more and more authority and began to form a considerable part of the new definition of romanticism, it was again the teaching of Böhl and of Durán, which, selecting from the newly defined romanticism the elements that harmonized with its own nationalistic tendencies and rejecting the elements of manifestly French origin (and often the very term "romanticism," thereby effecting a comparative *rapprochement* with avowed classicism), formed that important phase of romantic criticism characterized as patriotic eclecticism.

Although the reign of French romanticism in Spain did not begin until 1835, its influence had begun to creep into Spain many years before, doing much harm to the good name of that romanticism which was steadily gaining favor as a distinctly Spanish movement. Larra was greatly influenced by the French school and was an ardent disciple of Victor Hugo's theories of

---

[25] Cf. pp. 7 and 8 of this paper;

[26] Cf. pp. 8 and 9 of this paper.

[27] This conception has survived in contemporary criticism of the movement. Cf. Julio Cejador y Frauca, *Historia de la Lengua y Literatura Castellana*, Madrid, 1917, Vol. VII, p. 36: "Lo que el romanticismo moderno trajo a España en el siglo XIX desde Inglaterra y, mediante Francia, desde Alemania, fué un nuevo fervor y como inesperado empujón, que despertó más los espíritus, haciéndoles apresurar el paso por el camino que ya llevaban. El arte español era ya romántico, esto es, nacional y cristiano, desde el siglo XVI, hasta el punto de proponérselo como dechado los románticos alemanes." And Andres González-Blanco, *op. cit.*, pp. 140–141: "Podríamos asegurar . . . que la fuerza de nuestro romanticismo estaba dentro, pero el impulso vino de fuera. Claro es que la patria de Calderón y de Lope de Vega no necesitaba de chispazos exteriores para encender el fuego romántico que había de inflamar España desde 1830."

freedom in art.[28] He saw in them the logical application to literature of the political theories of the eighteenth century. At the same time he tried to preach the historical romanticism of Durán although he did not understand it very well for his knowledge of Spanish literature did not go back much earlier than the beginning of the eighteenth century.[29] As early as 1832–1833, *El Pobrecito Hablador* begins complaining about the "mezquinas traducciones extrañas a nuestras costumbres"[30] and advises young men of letters to study "más nuestros poetas antiguos, en vez de traducir tanto y tan mal, etc.," and to be "más celosos del honor nacional."[31]

In 1833, in his *Prólogo*[32] to the Duque de Rivas' *Moro Expósito*, Alcalá Galiano speaks of how "pródigos de barbarismos y solecismos" the French romanticists are, of how they "se arrastran y despeñan en simas de insondable bajeza," and concludes that French romanticism is no better than French classicism. He is so confused by the half dozen different and even contradictory definitions he so bluntly evolves for both romanticism and classicism that he concludes by *apparently* casting the distinction aside: "El autor . . . no ha pretendido hacerlo *clásico* ni *romántico*, divisiones arbitrarias en cuya existencia no cree, etc."; but by *really* keeping the vital distinction of Böhl and of Durán: "Ha elegido un asunto de la historia de España y de los siglos medios, campo fertilísimo y hasta el día muy descuidado por nuestros poetas, a excepción de algunos dramáticos; y si alguna vez tratado por nuestros trágicos modernos, tratado en el gusto llamado *clásico*, es decir, de un modo que no le cuadra." The *Prólogo*, romantic in everything but the claim to be so, is the first example of that eclectic criticism which was to reign for the next ten years. Certain anonymous articles on the *Moro Expósito* appearing in the *Revista Española* of May 23 and 24, 1834, show the same vacillation as Alcalá Galiano with a decided balance in favor of ro-

---

[28] Cf. Fígaro, *op. cit.*, Vol. 2, p. 335.

[29] Cf. José R. Lomba y Pedraja, *Mariano José de Larra (Fígaro), como crítico literario*, in *La Lectura*, 1919, Vol. 3, pp. 234, 235.

[30] Fígaro, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 115.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[32] Ángel de Saavedra, *Obras completas*, Madrid, 1897, Vol. 3.

manticism.[33] We find this eclecticism in all the important reviews; *El Artista* (1835–1836), *El Semanario Pintoresco Español* (1836–1857), *La Revista de Madrid* (1838–1845), *El Iris* (1841), etc. Although *El Artista* was in some respects favorable to romanticism, it represents rather a compromise between romanticism and classicism.[34] The *Semanario Pintoresco* preaches the formation of a new school which will choose the good from both romanticism and classicism, the purpose of which will be to recall, in the name of patriotism and the Christian religion, the ancient glories of Spain.[35] By 1841 there seems to be no further quarrel; Salvador Bermúdez de Castro in an article[36] in *El Iris* thinks that the fusion between classicism and romanticism has been fully accomplished.

It is true, of course, that there was some criticism too decidedly partisan to be characterized as eclectic. It is represented by three distinct points of view. First, the criticism that clearly inclines to French romanticism, as for example, Espronceda's *El Pastor Clasiquino* (1835), a satire against Arcadian poetry; much of the criticism of Eugenio de Ochoa in *El Artista* and of Fernando de Vera e Isla in *No me olvides*, etc. Second, the criticism continued by many of the old classicists who lived throughout the whole period of romanticism. Lista died in 1848, Gallego in 1853, Quintana in 1857, and Mora not until 1864. In an article *De la moderna escuela sevillana de literatura*[37] (1838), we find Lista still faithful to the theories of Luzán. Third, the criticism that was not romantic, classic, or eclectic, but which might best be characterized as satiric and at times, even realistic. It often finds expression in comedy. Already in 1835 Bretón de los Herreros is satirizing romanticism in *Todo es farsa en este mundo* and *Me voy de Madrid*. The best example of the satiric essay against romanticism is the famous article *El Romanticismo y los Románticos*[38] of Mesonero Romanos,

[33] E. Allison Peers, *The "Moro Expósito" and Spanish Romanticism*, in *Studies in Philology* Vol. XIX, 1922, pp. 308–316.

[34] Cf. Georges Le Gentil, *Les Revues Littéraires de l'Espagne pendant la première moitié du XIXe siècle*, Paris, 1909, p. 49.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

[36] Parts of this article are quoted by Georges Le Gentil, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

[37] Published in the *Revista de Madrid;* cf. Georges Le Gentil, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

[38] Published in *Escenas Matritenses por el Curioso Parlante*, 2a serie (1836–1842), *nueva edición*, Madrid, 1881; cf. *ibid.*, note, p. 110.

which the author had the courage to read before the Liceo and which was published in the *Semanario Pintoresco* of September 10, 1837. This was to be the inspiration for another comedy of Bretón's, *Ella y Él* the following year (1838).[39] A successful imitator of Bretón in this *genre* was Iza Zamácola in his comedy *El clásico y el romántico* (1841) in which both extremes are satirized.

And so, we find four distinct currents in Spanish literature at the time of Avellaneda's first productions: the eclectic, the romantic, the classic, and the satiric or realistic. We shall see that though her work shows traces of all these influences, most of it, indeed, the best of it may be considered as exemplary of that point of view we have above described as patriotic eclecticism.[40]

---

[39] Cf. Georges Le Gentil, *Le poète Manuel Bretón de los Herreros et la Société Espagnole de 1830 à 1860*, Paris, 1909, p. 98.

[40] Cf. M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de la poesía hispano-americana*, Madrid, 1911, Vol. 1, pp. 266, 267; Enrique Piñeyro, *op. cit.*, p. 237; Aurelia Castillo de González, *Biografía de Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda y juicio crítico de sus obras*, Havana, 1887, p. 11; José María Chacón y Calvo, *Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, las influencias castellanas, examen negativo*, Havana, 1914, p. 23.

I

THE LIFE OF GERTRUDIS GÓMEZ DE AVELLANEDA[1]

Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda was born March 23, 1814,[2] on the island of Cuba in the town which was called Puerto Príncipe at that time but which today is called Camagüey. She was of pure Spanish ancestry; her father, Manuel Gómez de Avellaneda, chief naval officer in Cuba, was born in Constantina in the province of Seville, Spain; her mother, Francisca de Arteaga, was born in Cuba of a distinguished old family of pure Spanish stock.

Puerto Príncipe was a backward town without any schools and except for tutors in history and geography, the only schooling Avellaneda had was her reading and her own attempts at composition, and much of this had to be done in secret on account of parental opposition. Her mother was fond of drawing and music but these subjects had little interest for the young Gertrudis. Instead of playing with dolls, she wrote plays and practiced the translation of French poetry. It is said that she dictated verse to her elders even before she was able to read and write. At the age of eight, she wrote a fairy tale, *El gigante de cien cabezas*, and at twelve she knew by heart and was able to interpret the best selections of Quintana, Arriaza and Meléndez. She was fond of Racine and Corneille and preferred the theater to all other *genres*. She was about twenty-one years of age when she took the leading part in the performance of Heredia's translation of Ducis' *Abufar*, through which she won fame as a clever actress. Whereupon her mother forbade her to read any more dramatic works. So instead of reading dramas, she decided she would have to write some. She says, "Desde entonces mi amor

---

[1] The chief sources of this chapter are contained in the Biographical Bibliography, p. 114, of this paper. References to these sources are given only in the case of controversies and of direct quotations. All additional sources are indicated at the appropriate places.

[2] The question as to whether the year was 1814 or 1816 is definitely settled by the certificate of baptism, cf. Lorenzo Cruz de Fuentes, *Autobiografía y cartas de la ilustre poetisa Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda*, Madrid, 1914, pp. 266–267.

al teatro se hizo una pasión absoluta."[3] It was about this time that she composed a drama entitled *Hernán Cortés*. We do not know what became of this play but it is quite likely that it had the same fate as all her early work, which she burned almost as fast as it was written as not measuring up to her strict requirements.

In 1823 her father died.[4] This was the first grief she had known, but although she was only nine years old, the fond memory of her father had a lasting influence on her life. He had awakened in her the desire to see the land of his birth, and she would never be satisfied until she could manage to go to Spain. Less than ten months after the death of her father, her grief was deepened by her mother's marriage with Gaspar Escalada, a Spanish colonel. The family, however, saw little of Escalada, for a year after the marriage he was obliged to go with his regiment to another city. He was away for eight years except for a yearly leave of absence of two or three months, which he spent at Puerto Príncipe.

Doña Gertrudis' only friends at this time were the three Carmona sisters and her cousin Angeles Arteaga, all serious minded like herself and all intellectually precocious; when they were together, they improved their time discussing questions of literature and philosophy.

At about the age of fourteen, Avellaneda's family promised her in marriage to the richest bachelor in the country. She would have all the material blessings the world could afford; her spiritual condition would be nothing short of her material well-being for she idealized her fiancé, endowing him with the sum total of the perfections of the heroes of all her favorite novels. However, her disillusionment came quickly; she broke the engagement on the eve of the wedding.

It was at this time, probably in 1833,[5] that Escalada returned to Puerto Príncipe. Broken in health, he wished to go to Spain

---

[3] *Doña Gertrudis Gómez Avellaneda de Savater, Apuntes biográficos* in *La Ilustración*, Madrid, Saturday, November 3, 1850.

[4] In 1839 she says he has been dead sixteen years, cf. *Autobiografía y cartas*, p. 40.

[5] Escalada and Avellaneda's mother had been married in 1824; "sólo un año estuvimos con mi padrastro. . . . Ocho años duró esta separación;" making a total of nine years after the marriage; cf. *Autobiografía y cartas*, pp. 42 and 43.

to recover, but Avellaneda's mother was loath to leave her relatives. Nevertheless, Escalada began to make preparations for leaving. To make the break less difficult, the family went to Santiago de Cuba to spend a few months. Although Avellaneda wrote some poetry here that was enthusiastically received, she spent most of her time in social gaiety. Finally, Escalada prevailed on his wife to leave for Spain, and the family set sail on April 9, 1836. On the first of July they arrived at Bordeaux; while there, Avellaneda visited the Château de Brède of Montesquieu and the municipal museum, and heard the Parisian prima donna, Mme. Falcon, sing *Robert le Diable.* Avellaneda liked music and painting and although she did not follow these arts, she never missed a chance to hear an opera or to visit an art gallery. After spending a few pleasant weeks at Bordeaux, the family went on to La Coruña in Galicia, the home of Escalada. Here it was that Escalada revealed his true character. Life was made so wretched that Avellaneda's brother Manuel was obliged to leave. Under these circumstances, Avellaneda met a young man named Ricafort who fell in love with her. She opened her heart to him and told him of her troubles at home; he proposed marriage and at the same time, probably feeling her intellectual superiority, he tried to persuade her to give up her ambitions for a literary career. It was a struggle between the love of art and the will to live, and the latter was the victor. However, the marriage was postponed as Ricafort was obliged to leave for the army. And now that he was away and Avellaneda had time for sober reflection, she began to realize the divergencies in their natures and to doubt the advisability of the proposed union. Her doubts were strengthened by her brother's insistence that she definitely give up Ricafort and go with him to Andalusia to visit the relatives of their father. She followed her brother's advice and never heard anything more of Ricafort. They left La Coruña March 23, 1838, and after traveling by stage-coach, litter, horseback and steamer they arrived at Lisbon, April 5th. From Lisbon they went on to the south of Spain. Here Avellaneda spent about two years (1838–1839), important years of her life they were, at Cadiz, Seville and Constantina, in which latter place

she found the family archives which furnished her the material for her drama *Munio Alfonso* and her novel *Dolores*.

It was during her stay at Seville that Avellaneda met Ignacio de Cepeda y Alcalde,[6] a twenty-three year old law student at the University of Seville, a refined and cultured gentleman who was destined to have a lasting influence on her life and work. The importance of this influence cannot be better stated than in the following words of José A. Rodríguez García: "De su pasión por Cepeda han de nacer varias de sus obras, y acaso la circunstancia de no abandonarse por completo a su amor fué lo que a la poetisa impelió a entregarse del todo a la literatura, llevándola, en alas de su ambición literaria y de la gloria, a Madrid, viaje decisivo en su existencia y al cual se debe que la Avellaneda lograse llegar a la plenitud de su extraordinario talento literario."[7] The same old struggle arises between love and her ambition for fame and if love loses this time, it is not for lack of love on Avellaneda's part. In a series of twenty-five letters[8] written in Seville to Cepeda, from July 13, 1839 to June 3, 1840, we can study the progress of this struggle. The tenor of these letters is of unrequited love. It was she who was always the tireless pursuer, and from the very first it is evident that Cepeda was not seriously in love with her. She was obliged to be content with mere friendship but she had even lost her faith in it. We see her trying to forget, by constantly rekindling her interest in literary production. For her vacant and grieving heart she sought the palliative of artistic creativeness and the fame and glory of a literary career; "¡Busco yo la opinión pública con preferencia a los más dulces afectos!"[9] We do not have any document on how the final break took place, but we do know that after a brief visit of Cepeda to Seville, Avellaneda left for Madrid in the latter part of 1840, and in the twenty-sixth letter written from Madrid, November 24, 1840, a letter which really forms a conclusion to the twenty-five above-mentioned letters,

---

[6] It was to Cepeda that she wrote in Seville and Madrid the series of letters that constitute her *Autobiografía y cartas*.

[7] José A. Rodríguez García, *de la Avellaneda, Colección de artículos*, Havana, 1914, p.48.

[8] Contained in *Autobiografía y cartas*.

[9] *Autobiografía y cartas*, letter No. 25.

we find her deeply absorbed in literary pursuits. She says, "No pienso en *amores* . . .; para mí pasó la juventud del corazón, etc."

During Avellaneda's stay in the south of Spain, she was known under the pseudonym of *La Peregrina* and under this name she published her first verses in Manuel Cañete's *La Aureola* at Cadiz in 1839. On June 6, 1840, her drama *Leoncia* was first played in Seville and was successfully produced later at Cadiz, Malaga and Granada. By this time she had written *Sab*, which she had begun while passing through Lisbon; she obtained many subscriptions for it in Seville, Granada and Malaga, but it was not published until later. It is interesting to observe that her favorite authors about this time were Scott, Mme. de Staël, Chateaubriand, Lamartine, Lista, Quintana and Heredia, and she was rather naïvely interested in the similarity that some claimed to find between herself and Mme. de Staël.

She had met Lista in Seville and now at Madrid whither her fame as poet and playwright had preceded her, she met at the Liceo and in other gatherings, and won the friendship of Juan Nicasio Gallego, the Duque de Rivas, the Duque de Frías, Manuel Quintana, Espronceda, Zorrilla, García Tassara, Pastor Díaz, Bretón de los Herreros, Hartzenbusch, Roca de Togores, and many other prominent men of letters. It was at this time that she devoted herself to the study of Latin, history and other subjects, which she thought necessary for the intellectual career that seemed now to be her only choice.

In 1841 Avellaneda offered to the public her first collection of poetry with a *Prólogo* by Juan Nicasio Gallego. This volume contained forty-five poems. The first poem is the sonnet *Al partir*, which had been written in Cuba in 1836; the last poem, the sonnet *Mi mal*. Much had happened in Avellaneda's life between the writing of these two sonnets, and as we read the poems of 1841, we can trace the development of the gentle melancholy of *Al partir* into the sorrow and hopelessness of *Mi mal*. From 1841 to 1845 she published four novels: *Dos Mujeres*, *Espatolino*, *Guatimozín* and *La Baronesa de Youx*.

In 1843 we find her deeply absorbed by her literary ambitions, and although she began to feel the need of going abroad in

order to expand her horizon, for the time being she found plenty to keep her occupied at Madrid. She had always been ambitious to write a great tragedy. In this she succeeded in *Alfonso Munio*, the first performance of which (June 13, 1844), at the Teatro de la Cruz, according to Pastor Díaz was not only "la glorificación de su autora; fué un triunfo mayor para el arte"; it was not only "un acontecimiento particular de su vida, fué un gran suceso para el teatro."[10] It was on this occasion that someone made the famous remark: "Es mucho hombre esta mujer"; which later gave rise to much discussion as to the relative importance of the masculine and feminine elements in Avellaneda's art, and which it has been said, the authoress often repeated herself with great satisfaction. *El Príncipe de Viana* was first played October 7, 1844, at the Teatro de la Cruz. *Egilona* was printed in February, 1845, but its performance was delayed until June 18, 1846, by the illness of the actor, Carlos Latorre.[11] Both *El Príncipe de Viana* and *Egilona* were designated as *dramas trágicos*.

In 1845 the Liceo of Madrid opened a poetical contest, financed by the philanthropist, Vicente Bertrán de Lis, for the purpose of celebrating the clemency of Queen Isabel II in freeing certain political criminals from the death penalty. Avellaneda submitted two poems, one in her own name and one in the name of her step-brother, Felipe Escalada. The one in her own name won the *accessit*, the other, the first prize. For this double victory the Liceo presented her with a golden laurel wreath which, in the absence of the Queen, was placed upon her brow by the Infante Don Francisco de Paula, who later in the same year bestowed another gift upon her for an ode she had written at his request; and yet, in spite of her promising and already dazzling career, she was weary of the adulation and obsequiousness of the capital and overwhelmed with the burden of a life devoid of happiness. Her affair with the poet Gabriel García Tassara had ended in indifference; nobody measured up to

---

[10] Nicomedes Pastor Díaz, *Noticia biográfica de la Excma. Sra. Da. Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda de Sabater*, in *Obras literarias*, Vol. 1, pp. XXI and XXII.

[11] Cf. Cotarelo y Mori, *Examen de libros*, in *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, Vol. 2, Madrid, 1915, p. 368.

Cepeda and he had announced that he was thinking of matrimony. Love had passed, and glory had lost its brilliancy. She would now seek the luxurious life of traveling or the simple life of the country-side. But this required money; so it was for money that she would continue her literary career. If she would marry, it would be for convenience, but she was sure she would never marry.

However, early the very next year (1846) she did marry, and it is rather difficult to determine her motives. It seems to have been human pity rather than human love that prompted her, and this she frankly admitted to her fiancé.[12] Don Pedro Sabater was a distinguished young man of considerable and varied ability; he had written a romantic drama, *Don Enrique el Bastardo* (1841), and had contributed essays on manners and customs to the *Semanario Pintoresco* in 1839; he was a member of the Cortes and *Jefe Político* of Madrid. At the time of their marriage he was a hopeless invalid, and Avellaneda wished to make his last days on earth as pleasant as possible. With womanly tenderness she cared for him night and day. After trying the best medical skill in Madrid to no avail, they consulted the best physicians in Paris where Sabater underwent a very serious operation, but on their way back to Spain, he died at Bordeaux on the first day of August of the same year they were married. Alone and helpless Avellaneda sought consolation for her bereavement in the peace of the Convent of Lorette at Bordeaux where she spent several months before returning to Madrid at the end of the year. Love, friendship, the lure of fame one by one had disappeared, and now she even lost the pride that made her believe in her genius: "Siento que se apagó la última chispa de la creadora llama de la poesía."[13]

Cepeda was no longer considering matrimony and Avellaneda was evidently still in love with him, but the glow of youthful fancy had gone and she began to feel the impulses of mature womanhood; a home and children were her greatest need. At this time she was troubled with nervous crises and insomnia,

---

[12] Cf. *Cuartetos al Sr. don Pedro Sabater*, sent to Sabater before the marriage; *Obras literarias*, Madrid, 1869–1871, Vol. 1, p. 210.

[13] *Autobiografía y cartas*, p. 179.

from which she suffered for the rest of her life, and this probably explains in part her continuous and ever-increasing state of high religious exaltation. In the latter part of the year 1847 Cepeda, fleeing a love that he wished to conquer, came to Madrid and prepared for his trip through the capitals of Europe and through Turkey and Palestine. The old friendship was renewed but in the end Cepeda remained as indifferent as ever to Avellaneda's confessions of love for him. All her reasonable attempts to enter into the seething stream of life had been checked; all that was left was God, and she was fully convinced that only God could give her the peace that she longed for. She kept moderately active in the society of the capital, but through all her mingled interests and emotions, the religious note was dominant.

The biblical drama *Saúl* had been written and read before the Liceo in 1846. Later Avellaneda recasted it, and it was finally played October 29, 1849, at the Teatro Español, but with only a moderate degree of success in spite of the magnificent staging. It was in 1849 that her novel *La velada del helecho o el donativo del diablo* appeared in the *Semanario Pintoresco*. In 1850 she published the second edition of her poetry. This edition contained the same *Prólogo* of Gallego as the edition of 1841 followed by a *Noticia Biográfica* signed "Los Editores", but actually written by Pastor Díaz. Fifty-four new poems were added to the poems of 1841, some of which latter had been revised and four of which were omitted. The last poem of the edition of 1850, *El último acento de mi arpa*, dedicated to her friend and compatriot, Doña Leocadia de Zamora, is rather an artistic gesture than a sincere farewell to her genius. While we saw that the poetry of 1841 ended with a note of despair, in the new poetry of the edition of 1850 we find along with this note of despair, the consolation of religious faith; we discover here the first steps toward that mysticism which was to mark the last years of her life. In 1851 the novel *Dolores* appeared in the *Semanario Pintoresco*.[14] The first performance of the drama

[14] This novel was again published in Havana in 1860 in the *Diario de la Marina*, but because of the earlier date (1851), Aurelia Castillo de González is wrong in calling it "el último poderoso destello del genio de la Avellaneda"; cf. Aurelia Castillo de González, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

Flavio Recaredo took place October 27, 1851, at the Teatro del Príncipe.

The important works of the year 1852 are three dramas: *La verdad vence apariencias*, first played at the Teatro del Príncipe January 22d; *Errores de corazón*, first played at the Teatro del Drama on May 7th, and *El donativo del diablo*, a three-act prose dramatization of the novel *La velada del helecho o el donativo del diablo;* it was first played at the Teatro del Príncipe, October 4th, and failed; and the comedy, *La hija de las flores, o todos están locos*, which was first played at the Teatro del Príncipe on October 21st; it had a run of more than two months in spite of the cool treatment it received from the critic Cañete, the director of *El Heraldo*. *La Aventurera* followed in the next year, being first played at the Teatro de Variedades, May 25, 1853. On June 3d, of the same year, the drama *Hortensia* was played at the Teatro del Príncipe; it was written in prose and was a translation of a posthumous drama of Soulié entitled *Hortense*.[15]

It was in 1853 that Gallego died leaving a seat vacant in the Spanish Academy. The Count of San Luis, Luis José Sartorius, Minister of the Interior in the Narváez ministry, was anxious to become a member of the Academy. Señora Avellaneda had dedicated her drama, *Errores del corazón*, to the Count, and had contributed a poem to an *Album poético* (1852) dedicated to the Count by the chief poets of Spain. Sartorius was a man of the greatest honesty and sincerity who had done much good in behalf of the national art and literature, having helped to found the Liceo Artístico y Literario and to build up the Teatro Español. It is said that Sartorius would have been elected at once, if it had not been for his modesty in refraining from requesting admission. Avellaneda was advised by the Duque de Rivas, Pacheco, Pastor Díaz, Apecechea and other academicians to apply for the vacant seat. She at first hesitated fearing opposition on account of her sex, but finally acceded to the continued solicitations of her friends, who alleged that there would be no doubt about the success of her application. However, in order to be sure of being elected, she wrote to Sartorius

[15] Cf. Cotarelo y Mori, *op. cit.*, p. 375.

and asked him not to compete, declaring that Gallego wanted her to be his successor; she assured him that, as many of the members of the Academy were quite old men, it would not be long until there would be another vacancy. Sartorius gallantly replied in a letter dated January 28, 1853, that although he was loath to give up his chance, he would not only withdraw but would give her his support, provided the question of the eligibility of women should be decided in her favor; and on the same day he notified the Academy to this effect. Avellaneda replied to this letter thanking Sartorius and declaring that her action was motivated by a desire to see fulfilled the wishes of her deceased friend rather than by pride; she defended her claim and the rights of women to aspire to such positions. At the same time she tried to give the impression that it would not make much difference to her if she should not be elected. It was said that a large number of the members of the Academy were displeased at Sartorius' withdrawal and it was thought that Avellaneda was being used as a tool by Sartorius' political enemies. On February 3d, Avellaneda's request for admission was presented to the Academy and the meeting proved to be a very stormy one. At a later session which was held in secret, February 10th, Bretón de los Herreros formulated the following question: "¿Son admisibles o no las señoras a plazas de número de la Academia?" Six votes were cast in the affirmative while fourteen were cast in the negative. Thus was the candidacy of Avellaneda automatically annulled. She now felt that everybody was plotting against her and in a letter to Sartorius dated February 13, 1853, she even went so far as to blame him for her failure, declaring that his withdrawal of January 28th should have been absolute instead of being conditioned by the decision of the Academy on the question of the eligibility of women. Realizing the delicacy of his position Sartorius definitely withdrew his candidacy on February 17th, and a month later, March 17th, Antonio Ferrer del Río was unanimously elected.[16] Ave-

[16] The letters referred to above in connection with Avellaneda's attempt to enter the Academy are given in full by Juan Pérez de Guzmán in *La sucesión de D. Juan Nicasio Gallego en la Real Academia Española* published in *La Ilustración Española y Americana*, No. XLII, and No. XLIII, November, 1906; they reveal the rather unbecoming part Avellaneda played in the episode.

llaneda's feelings were keenly hurt by this issue of the affair, and now more than ever her most cherished desire was to retire from the world to the quiet and peace of pious solitude, but instead of retiring to the little house she had bought for herself in the country, we find her attacking her erstwhile opponents in a comedy *Los oráculos de Talía, o los duendes en palacio* played at the Teatro de la Cruz, March 15, 1855, and in three newspaper articles entitled *La Mujer*. Two comedies *La hija del rey René* (at the Teatro de la Cruz), and *Simpatía y antipatía*, were played on February 9th of the same year. That Avellaneda had not lost the admiration of the public was revealed by the enthusiastic applause accorded her poem *A la coronación del ilustre poeta Excmo. Sr. D. Manuel José Quintana* which she read before the throne at the coronation of Quintana by Queen Isabel II.

Cepeda, who had returned from his long trip in 1853 was married in 1854, and the second marriage of Avellaneda took place in 1855.[17] Her second husband was Colonel Domingo Verdugo Massieu, a nobleman employed in the palace and a member of the Cortes. The Queen, and her consort Don Francisco de Asís, attended the wedding in the capacity of *padrinos*. The marriage was a happy one and promised to bring the peace and calm that Avellaneda was longing for.

On March 20, 1858, at the Teatro del Circo, Avellaneda's drama, *Los tres amores*, was first played. It was received with considerable hostility. Another drama, *La Sonámbula*, had been similarly received March 4, 1854, at the Teatro del Príncipe. These plays were thought to offer along with an unseemly display of *amour-propre* a defense of the politics of Verdugo. They had been immediately withdrawn, and Avellaneda wishing to redeem her artistic reputation brought forth on the 9th of April, 1858, at the Teatro de Novedades, her biblical drama *Baltasar*, which was a great triumph and silenced most of the hostile critics. It had a run of more than thirty performances and Avellaneda was hailed on all sides as the modern Melpomene;

---

[17] Some have made the year of Avellaneda's second marriage 1853, but 1855 seems to be well established by José A. Rodríguez García, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

but in the midst of this triumph she was again overwhelmed with grief. Verdugo was always involved in politics. He had lost his position in the palace through the fall of the O'Donnell cabinet in 1856. Hostility against him increased and on the 14th of April, 1858, he was attacked on the street in broad daylight and seriously wounded.[18] After a two months' struggle between life and death, he recovered, but he never fully regained his former strength. The event created quite a stir in Madrid and people of all classes hastened to express their sympathy for Avellaneda and her husband in their misfortune.

In order to accelerate Verdugo's convalescence, the couple decided to take a long trip. Toward the end of the summer they went to the Pyrenees and after a brief trip into France, they went on to Barcelona, Valencia and various towns in Catalonia to spend the winter. Everywhere they were the objects of applause and enthusiastic welcome by all classes of society. At Condes, a part of the welcome consisted in the playing of Avellaneda's *La hija de las flores.*

But Verdugo's health did not improve. When General Francisco Serrano was appointed governor of the island of Cuba in 1859, he suggested that Verdugo accompany him and try the effect of a decided change of climate. Avellaneda was loath to leave her aged mother whose health was rapidly declining and who died the year after her departure, but she felt that her first duty was to her husband; they sailed from Cadiz, October 31, 1859, and arrived in Cuba, November 24th.

---

[18] I have been unable to determine the immediate cause of this quarrel. One of the stories tells how on the night of the first performance of *Baltasar*, Queen Isabel asked one of her ministers his opinion of the play. His reply was so insulting to Avellaneda that Verdugo swore to avenge the offense; in the quarrel which ensued, the minister stabbled Verdugo; cf. Aurelia Castillo de González, *op. cit.*, p. 62. Another story runs as follows: Antonio de Rivera, a newspaper man, criticized *Baltasar* very severely but nobody paid any attention to his opinions. So getting into a box close to the stage at the Teatro de Novedades, he threw a white cat in front of the actors in the midst of one of the most dramatic situations; the disturbance caused quite a flurry of laughter in the audience, which, however, soon recovered its composure. Rivera was recognized, and when Verdugo met him on the street, the quarrel arose and the former was wounded; cf. Julio Nombela y Campos, *Impresiones*, Vol. II, p. 421. Cotarelo, *op. cit.*, p. 363, tells us that Manuel Ovilo y Otero, *Manual de biografía y de bibliografía de los escritores españoles del siglo XIX*, Paris, 1859, gives the cause of the quarrel; this is so; he says it arose through the performance of *Baltasar*, but gives no further details. Cotarelo, *op. cit.* p. 379, also promises a full account of the affair; it would be very interesting to have the true facts.

The enthusiastic reception accorded her here was even greater than that of the previous year in Catalonia. On the evening of January 27, 1860, Avellaneda was crowned with a golden laurel wreath amid great ceremony in the Teatro de Tacón by the Liceo of Havana. During this ceremony some rather unimportant individual arose and made a long and tiresome speech. Avellaneda became pale with rage but managed to restrain her feelings, not, however, without biting her lips so hard that a little spot of blood was noticed on her fine batiste handkerchief as she removed it from her mouth.[19] Her comedy, *La hija del rey René* was played, and she herself read before the assembly her poem, *Al Liceo de la Habana.*[20] On May 10th she visited Puerto Príncipe, where she stayed a month and whence she went on to Matanzas, Sagua, Cienfuegos and Cárdenas. During her stay at Cienfuegos, work was completed on a new theater which was named Teatro de Avellaneda in her honor.

Not long after their arrival in Cuba Verdugo had an attack of yellow fever; after he recovered he went to Cárdenas (August, 1860), to attend to the commission assigned to him by General Serrano. While he was successfully fulfilling his duties and bringing many improvements to the locality, Avellaneda was occupied in literary pursuits. She edited a literary review *El Album Cubano*, the purpose of which was the dissemination of culture and new ideas, but which she had great difficulty in maintaining for lack of support and co-operation; and she published in the *Diario de la Marina*, *Mi última excursión a los Pireneos*. She also published a novel *El Artista Barquero, o los cuatro cinco de junio.*

It was during her stay in Cuba that the bitter but futile and puerile controversy arose as to whether Avellaneda belonged exclusively to Spanish or Cuban letters. Insinuations were made that Juan Nicasio Gallego was the real author of her various productions, and she was excluded from a library of Cuban writers on the ground that she was a Spanish writer who had renounced her Cuban birthright. Some of the attacks

---

[19] This incident was observed by Piñeyro and told to Salvador Salazar who related it in his *Milanés, Luaces y la Avellaneda como poetas dramáticos*, Havana, 1916, p. 20.

[20] *Obras literarias*, Madrid, 1869–1871, Vol. 1, p. 341.

were very venomous and wounded her to the quick,[21] and all this in spite of the fact that she had earnestly interceded with Isabel II for a more liberal government for Cuba. On the other hand, she was excluded for some unknown reason from the *Autores dramáticos contemporáneos y joyas del teatro español del siglo XIX*.[22]

Verdugo's health began to decline rapidly and being forced to give up his duties he went to Pinar del Río where he died October 28, 1863.[23] Toward the end of January of the following year Avellaneda brought his remains to Havana, and here in the Sanctuary of Belén she placed at the feet of the image of the Virgin the golden laurel wreath which had been bestowed on her by the Liceo of Havana, "como si con aquel acto quisiera manifestar que se desprendía de las pompas y vanidades mundanas."[24] It is said that it was at the suggestion of the Jesuits of Belén that she excluded *Sab* and *Dos Mujeres* from the final edition of her works.

She was now fully decided to retire to a convent, but her brother Manuel opposed this action as did her closest friends, and a physician advised her to seek distraction for her grief in traveling. So in May, 1864, she set out for the United States where she spent most of her time in New York. She made a short trip to Niagara Falls which inspired her poem *A vista del*

---

[21] Aurelia Castillo de González's statement, *op. cit.*, p. 30, that Avellaneda was not aware of the hostility of the Cubans toward her is without foundation; cf. particularly Avellaneda's letter to *El Siglo* of Havana, published in *El Siglo* of January 5, 1868, and edited in José Augusto Escoto, *Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, Cartes inéditas y documentos relativos a su vida en Cuba de 1859 a 1864*, Matanzas, 1912, pp. 177–180. In this letter she calls herself an "escritora cubana," and stresses the ridiculousness of the whole polemic.

[22] There has been a complete reversal of opinion in Cuba; present-day Cuban critics seem to be vying with each other to adduce the best proofs of Avellaneda's "cubanismo." However this much discussed question seems settled beyond further dispute by Menéndez y Pelayo. *Historia de la poesía hispano-americana*, Madrid, 1911, Vol. 1, pp. 264–265: "la grande alma poética que ahora se ofrece a nuestra contemplación, aunque sea honra imperecedera de América por su origen, pertenece enteramente a Europa por su educación y desarrollo, y ocupa con justicia uno de los primeros lugares en el Parnaso español de la era romántica."

[23] An article on the work and death of Verdugo was published in *El Siglo* of Havana, November 9, 1863, and was edited in José Augusto Escoto, *op. cit.*, pp. 136, 141.

[24] Aurelia Castillo de González, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

The affidavit by which she gave legal authority to the bequest reads in part as follows: "De este modo dedico y consagro el galardón más bello que han tenido en el mundo mis humildes trabajos literarios a Aquella por quien recibió el mismo mundo el don más sublime del Altísimo; Nuestro Redentor Jesucristo, etc."; cf. José Augusto Escoto, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

Niágara.[25] About the middle of July she left New York for Liverpool. Stopping at London and Paris, she arrived at Madrid in October. After a short stay at Madrid she went to Seville where she spent the rest of her days except for a few short trips to Madrid and Paris.

In 1865 she began to prepare the final "complete" edition of her works. She spent many years at this work, probably until 1871, the year in which the last volume was published. This edition is composed of five volumes the first of which was published in 1869. This first volume contains Gallego's *Prólogo* to the 1841 edition of her poems, the *Noticia Biográfica* of Pastor Díaz which introduced the 1850 edition of her poems and a biographical *Adición a los anteriores apuntes* signed E. G. The first volume, furthermore, contains her poetry; it is composed of all the poems of the edition of 1850 except four, and forty-two new poems written after 1850. The other four volumes contain her plays, novels and tales.

While she was busily engaged in this collecting and recasting of her works she did not cease to produce, for it was during this time that she wrote her *Devocionario poético*[26] published in Seville in 1867, her drama *Catilina* printed in 1869, but never played, and her two-act farce *El millonario*, which was first published in Volume III of the final edition of her works. It is said that she intended to publish a sixth volume but her ill health did not permit the effort.

Avellaneda's brother Manuel died in the month of January, 1869, and thus she was left alone in the world. Her last years were spent in prayer and meditation. It has been said that she was insane, but this was denied by José Ramón de Betancourt who visited her until the time of her death.[27] It is also disproved by the letters she wrote to Luis Coloma, the last of which was written in Madrid, March 10, 1872.[28] In all of these letters,

---

[25] In *Obras literarias*, Vol. 1, p. 371.

[26] The original *Devocionario* (1847) was lost by the publishing house *La Publicidad* when it withdrew from business.

[27] Cf. Aurelia Castillo de González, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

[28] *Cuatro cartas inéditas de la Avellaneda* published by C. Eguía Ruiz in *Razón y Fe*, Madrid, November, 1918, pp. 348–362.

however, as well as in various letters written during her stay in Cuba,[29] she speaks of her bad health and shattered nerves, and it is evident that she was a constant sufferer. She died February 1, 1873. Valera says that not more than ten persons attended her funeral, of whom he only knew one, Luis Vidart.[30] This may be explained as a result of the unpopularity of the friends of the temporarily dethroned Bourbons (in the edition of 1869 of her poetry, Avellaneda did not omit the poems dedicated to the Queen); moreover, the homage to genius accorded by romantic enthusiasm had cooled to thoughtless indifference. Several prominent Cubans were present, among whom was José Ramón de Betancourt, who placed a wreath on the bosom of the poetess in the name of her native town of Puerto Príncipe.

---

[29] Cf. José Augusto Escoto, *op. cit.*

[30] Juan Valera, *Florilegio de poesías castellanas del siglo XIX*, Madrid, 1903, Vol. V, p. 336. Teodoro Guerrero also gives a short account of the funeral and laments the fact that so little attention was paid to the death of a great writer, in an article entitled *Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda*, dated February 5, 1873, and published in the *Ilustración española y americana* of February 24, 1873.

II

TRAGEDIES AND DRAMAS

Leoncia (1840)

Avellaneda's first dramatic attempt did not gain a reputation for her and never reached Madrid. *Leoncia* was written in five acts in prose and in a modern setting, and was thus quite different from the *genre* in which she was to excel and win enduring fame. Much has been said about the virility of Avellaneda's genius. However, when the restraint of verse-making is absent, this side of her nature is not apparent; every page is personal, feminine, romantic. In the character of Leoncia we find a study of the misunderstood woman of thirty, who in this case was none other than Avellaneda herself, and throughout the play we discover the same outbursts of passion, the same declarations of love, the same spirit of pessimism and the same denunciation of social prejudices that occur everywhere in the *Autobiografía y cartas*.

In the roving spirit of Don Fernando (Act II, scene 4) we find an expression of Mme. de Staël's cosmopolitanism, and it is interesting to observe that in 1839 Avellaneda had been reading *Corinne*.[1]

Elena's survival from shipwreck and her subsequent meeting with her mother recalls the somewhat similar fate of Martínez de la Rosa's Rugiero, but the play has no other point in common with *La conjuración de Venecia*.

In the *dénouement* of the play the hero finds that he is betrothed to his half-sister and that the woman he is in love with is the latter's mother. The unnatural love of brother and sister was the subject of Ducis' *Abufar*, which we know Avellaneda was quite familiar with.[2] However, whereas in Ducis' play the

[1] Cf. *Autobiografía y cartas*, p. 116.
[2] Cf. p. 19 of this paper.

lovers think that they are brother and sister but happily learn in the end they are not, in Avellaneda's play the principals do not know of their unfortunate relationship until the end, which is accordingly tragic.

The play is utterly devoid of the heroic and religious note through which the early tragedies were to win merited favor, and in no way foreshadows the dramatic system of these tragedies. The fatality with which the action is accomplished has been described as peculiar to Avellaneda's later manner;[3] but the argument is fortuitous as the same blind fate is found in *Don Álvaro*, *Los Amantes de Teruel*, etc.

The play remained unedited and was not included in the *Colección completa*. A copy of the original manuscript was used for a limited edition published in Madrid in 1917.

Munio Alfonso (1844)

As we saw in the last chapter, Avellaneda first became known in Madrid in 1840 and 1841 as a lyric poet. But the most dazzling literary triumphs of the preceding decade had been accomplished on the stage, and although Avellaneda says in 1869 that she did not write *Munio Alfonso* with the intention of having it played,[4] it is quite probable that she really hoped for glory in the theater as a solace for her broken heart.[5]

Again, in 1869, she says that in choosing the subject for the play she wished to prove: "una vez más que la edad media—desdeñada por la mayoría de los autores clásicos drámaticos—podía suministrar argumentos y caracteres no menos dignos de la tragedia que los rebuscados todavía en las historias de los antiguos Griegos y Romanos."[6] But this had been done before in the French classical manner by Quintana and Martínez de la Rosa and in the French romantic style by the Duque de Rivas, García Gutiérrez and Hartzenbusch; and, indeed, in

---

[3] Cf. *Prólogo* to *Leoncia* signed "C," Madrid, 1917, p. XI.

[4] Cf. *Prefacio* to *Munio Alfonso* in *Obras literarias de la Señora doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda*, Madrid, 1869–1871, Vol. 2, p. 3.

[5] Cf. p. 22 of this paper.

[6] Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, *loc. cit.*

Munio Alfonso we are bound to find important elements of the successive phases of the French influence still persisting. However, as Avellaneda makes no further declaration of principles, we must examine the work itself to seek a definition for its method.

The following is a résumé of the plot: The scene is laid in Toledo in the year 1142. Doña Blanca, Infanta of Navarre, is to be married to the young prince of Castile, Don Sancho, as a pledge of peace between the two countries, but Don Sancho and Fronilde, the daughter of Munio Alfonso, *rico-hombre* of Castile, are in love with each other.

Munio returns home after a series of victorious battles and places the trophies of war at the feet of the Empress. Munio accedes to the proposed union of his daughter with the Count Don Pedro Gutiérrez. He tells Fronilde of it, but she is struck with terror and only with the greatest difficulty conceals her trepidation. She wishes to stifle her love for Don Sancho but he insists that in the end he will marry her. While Don Sancho is declaring his love to Fronilde, Doña Blanca appears, and grasping the full meaning of the situation, affirms her desire to relieve Don Sancho from his contract.

Later, Don Sancho mounts the balcony of Munio's house. He has come to tell Fronilde of Blanca's decision, of his own stand and of his mother's acquiescence in the same; his brother Fernando will marry Doña Blanca and thus uphold a lasting peace between the realms of Castile and Navarre. Munio returning home recognizes Don Sancho leaping from the balcony. Seizing his sword he strikes Fronilde dead.

Learning the extent of his crime, he wishes to go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, but the Archbishop of Toledo informs him that the assembly of priests orders him to seek atonement by ceaseless fighting for the rest of his life against the Moors.

The historical material for this story can be found, as Avellaneda indicates herself[7] in the *Origen de las dignidades seglares de Castilla y León*, Toledo, 1618, of Salazar de Mendoza; the *Chrónica del ínclito emperador de España don Alfonso VII*,

[7] Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 2, p. 6.

Madrid, 1600, of Prudencio de Sandoval; the *Nobiliario* of Jerónimo Román de la Higuera; the *Primera parte de la descripción general de Áffrica*, Granada, 1573, of Luis del Mármol Carvajal, and the *Ascendencia ilustre, gloriosos hechos, y posteridad noble del famoso Nuño Alfonso, etc.*, Madrid, 1648, of Rodrigo Méndez Silva. Avellaneda adds that she got almost the whole of the argument from the last-mentioned source. This is the only one that gives Munio's will, part of which Avellaneda quotes, although it is contained in a later edition of the work of Sandoval dated Madrid, 1792, and entitled *Historia de los Reyes de Castilla y de León doña Urraca, hija de don Alonso Sexto: y don Alonso Séptimo, Emperador de las Españas.*[8] The other above-mentioned histories simply refer without detail to Munio's victory over the two Moorish leaders, and his triumphal entry into Toledo. The story as given by Méndez Silva and Prudencio de Sandoval is as follows: Munio and his troops retire to the hill of Montelo to await the onslaught of the kings of Cordova and Seville. They kneel in prayer for divine aid. After a terrible slaughter of Moors, the Christians win the fight. The heads of the two Moorish kings are cut off and carried in triumph on the tops of banners; endless trains of captives and beasts of burden carry off the booty. Thus did Munio Alfonso return to Toledo by the Alcantara gate in company with his band of heroes. They were received by the Empress Doña Berenguela and the Archbishop of Toledo, the Emperor being away at Segovia. The Empress ordered the heads of the Moorish kings to be sent to their wives. The following year Munio was killed in battle by the Moors. God permitted his death in order to punish him for having killed his daughter *unjustly* because he found her and some young man *making love* and did not have mercy on her as God had mercy on him in battle, or as Christ had mercy on the *adulterous* woman. Munio wished to expiate his crime by going on a long

[8] Menéndez y Pelayo regrets that Avellaneda did not consult the Latin *Chronica Adefonsi Imperatoris*, edited in Vol. XXI of *España Sagrada*, Madrid, 1797. Cf. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos*, Madrid, 1890–1908, Vol. XII, p. 32, note 1. The character of Munio is undoubtedly better defined in this chronicle than in any of the sources mentioned above, by the greater number of episodes and by the greater detail in general.

pilgrimage to Jerusalem, but the Archbishop of Toledo and a council of priests realizing that Munio's prowess was indispensable to the welfare of the kingdom, asked the Emperor to compel him to give up his pilgrimage and spend the rest of his life fighting the Moors in expiation of his crime.

In the work of Méndez Silva we find that the name of Munio's daughter whom he slew was Fronilde. Alfonso VII had two sons, Don Sancho and Don Fernando and a daughter, Doña Beatriz by his wife, Doña Berenguela, and a daughter, Doña Sancha by his wife, Doña Rica.[9] As a pledge of peace and alliance between Castile and Aragon, a marriage was planned between Doña Sancha and Don Ramón, Prince of Aragon, but this marriage was postponed until the Prince and Princess should reach a marriageable age. Then also, Alfonso VII being more anxious to have peace than war with Navarre, married his daughter, Doña Beatriz, to the King of Navarre.[10]

The marriage of Doña Beatriz to the King of Navarre, and the proposed marriage of Doña Sancha to the Prince of Aragon were simplified and changed by Avellaneda to a proposed marriage of Don Sancho to a fictitious Doña Blanca, Princess of Navarre. As historical facts these marriages had no relation with Munio's career. It was to establish this relation that Avellaneda adopted the above-mentioned simplification putting Don Sancho in the place of his two sisters. Moreover, as the romanticists were wont to make the unknown lover prove to be of royal blood,[11] and to have the heroine forced to a marriage she rebelled against,[12] Avellaneda did not have to seek far for precedents when she made Fronilde's lover, unknown historically and unknown to Munio, turn out to be the Prince, Don Sancho, and when, reversing the rôle of hero and heroine, she made the proposed marriage of Don Sancho a marriage he rebelled against. Furthermore, whereas history simply brands the act of Munio

---

[9] Cf. P. Juan de Mariana, *Historia General de España*, Valencia, 1794, Vol. 1, p. 467

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 466.

[11] Cf. *La conjuración de Venecia:* Rugiero proves to be the son of Pedro Morosini. *El Trovador:* Don Manrique proves to be the brother of Don Nuño de Artal.

[12] Cf. *Los Amantes de Teruel:* Isabel de Segura is forced to marry Don Rodrigo de Azagra. *El Trovador:* Attempt to force Leonor to marry Don Nuño de Artal. *Macías:* Elvira forced to marry Fernán Pérez.

as unjust, without indicating the extent of the guilt of his daughter, Avellaneda takes pains to make Fronilde guiltless and thus enhance the tragic situation.[13]

Most of the material for Munio's speech on the victory over the Moors in the last scene of Act I, and for the Count's speech on Munio's entry into Toledo in scene 4 of Act I of the edition of 1844 (scene 3 of Act I of the edition of 1869) is taken from the chronicle of Prudencio de Sandoval. Munio's speech recalls the speech of Don Rodrigue in *Le Cid* (Act IV, scene 3) which it is quite possible Avellaneda hoped to rival.

It has been said that *Munio Alfonso* was a restoration of fallen classicism.[14] Although Blanco García thinks that the chief inspiration for the play was the work of the Duque de Rivas, Hartzenbusch, García Gutiérrez and Zorrilla, he finds much in it that reminds him of the restraint of Quintana and Corneille; he finds Avellaneda opposed to the melodramatic methods of the romanticists and concludes that her tragedies represent a sort of restored classicism revitalized by the spirit of Christianity and national tradition.[15] It is certain that a definition here is very difficult. If we look for a romantic venturesome passion, we find it in Don Sancho; if we look for the triumph of a Cornelian sense of duty, we find it in Munio himself, who unfalteringly heeds the claims of his honor except when a higher duty, obedience to his prince, bids him give pause. While the personal note in the love relations of Don Sancho and Fronilde is of pure romantic quality, still the attempt to rationalize and motivate their actions is a classic trait. Although the play is rich in picturesque descriptions, it is utterly free from all the trappings and melodramatic paraphernalia of the romantic drama. The unities except that of action are wholly disregarded, while on the other hand, the *romance heroico*, a favorite meter in classical tragedy is used throughout (except for a hymn of sixteen lines, in assonanced hexasyllables), and we even find a classical figure of speech:

---

[13] This is very similar to the tragedy of *Don Álvaro* where the innocent Leonor is killed by her brother because he thinks her stained.

[14] Cf. Francisco Calcagno, *Diccionario Biográfico Cubano*, New York, 1878, p. 84.

[15] P. Francisco Blanco García, *La literatura española en el siglo XIX*, 2d edition, Madrid, 1899, *parte primera*, pp. 266, 267.

El sol apenas
rasgando de la noche el negro manto
comenzó por oriente su carrera. . . .[16]

While there is a small amount of the grotesque in the ghost stories in Act IV and in the description of the ugly in Munio's speech in the last scene of Act I, there is absolutely no comedy. It is easy to understand why some have seen in *Munio Alfonso* reminiscences of the manner of Quintana,[17] but in *Pelayo* the only emotion is that of indignation, the only struggle is an intellectual conflict. Pelayo is a sort of abstract personage, and while he represents the aspirations of a people, he does not show the passions of an individual soul. Accordingly, one can just as readily find the influence of the plays of the romanticists in *Munio Alfonso*. In the intense passion of Don Sancho and in the gloomy musings of Fronilde we have romantic elements which are no less personal than in Leonor and Don Álvaro of the Duque de Rivas' famous drama, and which threaten to transcend the heroic theme. The same "nay-saying" to life prevails in both the plots; the difference is in the ending. This spirit finally predominates in *Don Álvaro* with the suicide of the protagonist who makes the following exclamation: "Infierno, abre tu boca y trágame. Húndase el cielo, perezca la raza humana; exterminio, destrucción. . . ."; while *Munio Alfonso* ends with the expiation of Munio and the admonition to Don Sancho not to forget his mother nor the duties of his lofty station, and this new conclusion is the arch which unites the classical and romantic elements in Avellaneda's play.

In the face of all these endless contradictions, are we not forced to agree with Menéndez y Pelayo that Avellaneda's was a *sistema dramático propio*,[18] and can we not rightly define this system as a form of patriotic eclecticism in the theater? And was not this very system the reason for the great success of *Munio Alfonso* in the more or less sober and transitional days of 1844?

---

[16] Act IV, scene 1 of the edition of 1844. Act IV, scene 2 of the edition of 1869.

[17] Cf. M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de la poesía hispano-americana*, Madrid, 1911, Vol. 1, p. 266.

[18] Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.*, p. 267. Cf. also note 40, p. 18 of this paper.

A serious weakness has been pointed out in the play in the falling off of interest in the fourth act.[19] P. Francisco Blanco García has attempted to justify this act as indispensable for a Christian *dénouement* to the tragedy; in pagan tragedy, Munio would have committed suicide or would have been killed by Don Sancho; or failing death, he would have lived on without redemption; in any event the play would have ended with the third act, but Avellaneda needed the fourth act to give Munio the chance for Christian expiation of his crime.[20] Yet, this careful analysis of Avellaneda's method of dramatic expiation does not prove that the fourth act is not undramatic; how undramatic it is can best be realized by comparison with the swift *dénouement* of a somewhat similar situation in Shakespeare's *Othello*. Inasmuch as esthetic enjoyment cannot be conditioned by the exigencies of a theological bias, P. Blanco García's explanation does not seem to furnish a *raison d'être* for the act.

When, at the instance of many friends, Avellaneda finally agreed to the performance of *Munio Alfonso* in 1844, she realized its shortcomings and decided to recast it at once, but on account of the urgency of the many other tasks to which she was devoted, she was unable to do this until twenty-four years later. Of the result she says, "No me lisonjea la esperanza de haber hecho desaparecer todos los lunares que le afeaban; pero creo que lo he purgado de los más capitales, todos ellos de forma; pues no he querido—ni en él ni en ninguna de mis obras—mudar el pensamiento ni el plan."[21]

Besides the reversal of the names of the title, what changes did she make? The recasting is considerably shorter than the original. The chief omissions are the soliloquies of the edition of 1844, which are entirely suppressed or replaced by dialogue. In the original edition Fronilde's soliloquy comprising all of scene 2 of Act I is used to contribute to the exposition; but scene 5 of Act I between Fronilde and Sancho is given as scene 2 in the edition of 1869 thus doing away with the soliloquy and hastening the action. Again, Munio's soliloquy comprising all

[19] *Ibid.*
[20] P. Francisco Blanco García, *op. cit.*, p. 266.
[21] Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 2, pp. 4, 5.

of scene 3 of Act II is entirely suppressed. It reveals the old hero's tender love for his daughter and contains passages of genuine lyric beauty, but the action of the play suffers nothing from its loss. Another soliloquy which is considerably shortened is that of Fronilde in scene 3 of Act III. Munio has just gone out into the storm in search of Don Sancho. Fronilde feels an intimate relationship between her own struggling passions and the violence of the storm:

> ¡En tí veo a la vez, noche profunda,
> remedo triste y funeral presagio . . . !

Overcome with fear she kneels in prayer to the virgin. In the edition of 1869, the storm is much less the ominous counterpart of Fronilde's feelings, and the prayer is shorter and more solemn. It is true that the action is hastened, yet there is something coldly classical about the scene, whereas in the edition of 1844 the long lyric pause before the action that is to bring about the catastrophe, the arrival of Don Sancho on the balcony of Munio's house, produces a decidedly romantic effect. The intimacy between the tragic action and the elemental agitation of nature is further developed in the report of the Count to the Archbishop in scene 1 of Act IV. In the edition of 1869 the storm is barely mentioned and the story of ghosts is entirely omitted. The treatment of popular superstitions was a romantic trait that was entirely out of fashion in 1869.

In some cases the verbosity of the original is lessened, thus heightening the dramatic effect by the terseness and aptitude of the language. A good example of this change is the end of scene 2 of Act III. Fronilde has tried to keep Munio from going out into the stormy night; her feelings have been communicated to him, and tearing himself away he exclaims,

> ¡Vive Cristo, que no alcanzo
> a vencer la flaqueza que me oprime!

In the edition of 1869 this is changed to simply;

> ¡Vive Cristo, que lloro . . . qué locura!

Likewise, the dramatic climax at the end of scene 4 of Act III is considerably simplified in scene 5 of Act III in the edition of 1869. Munio's words are fewer; they are monosyllabic; his action is more direct and spontaneous. At times, however, this terseness has quite the opposite effect and does violence to a real dramatic passage. At the end of scene 2 of Act II, after Munio has told Fronilde of the plans to marry her to the Count, in the edition of 1844 Fronilde cannot conceal her emotion and after Munio chides her as follows:

> ¡Eh! ¡basta, vive Dios! que ya me cansa
> tan infundado lamentar,

she rushes from the stage exclaiming in terror:

> Os dejo . . .
> Os dejo ya señor. ¡Oh, Virgen Santa!,

whereas in the edition of 1869 she succeeds in concealing her emotion, and taking leave she calmly says to her father, "Seréis obedecido." This is classical restraint. The scene is less forceful than the original; but by giving Munio less cause for suspicion, Avellaneda makes the tragic action much more probable, thereby adding strength to the part that needs it most. Another omission that deserves particular mention is the following ridiculous hyperbole that is found in the speech of Munio to the Empress, near the end of scene 6 of Act I of the edition of 1844:

> Con prisa tanta la incansable muerte
> ejerce al fin su duro ministerio
> que allí cabeza en la llanura salta
> que aun no conoce que le falta el cuerpo.

In the way of additions, the most noteworthy is the increased importance of the rôle of the Count. This helps to dispense with soliloquies and facilitates the exposition, but it retards and complicates the action and is contrary to the general tendency of the recasting which is toward simplification and coherence. The first example of this addition is scene 4 of Act I of the edition

of 1869, in which the Count asks the Empress to favor his suit for Fronilde's hand. This scene has no counterpart in the edition of 1844. Act II in both versions ends with a soliloquy of Don Sancho in which he resolves to have Fronilde at all costs, but in the edition of 1869 a new scene, scene 7, is intercalated in this soliloquy; the Count comes on the scene and announces to Don Sancho his hopes of marrying Fronilde. Don Sancho tells him this cannot be, and after the Count leaves the stage, Don Sancho finishes the soliloquy. The new scene seems to help to motivate Don Sancho's decision but the situation is rather strained and the effect is artificial. Again in scene 2 of Act IV, of the edition of 1869, which corresponds to scene 1 of Act IV, of the edition of 1844, the Count relates to the Archbishop the episode of Don Sancho's warning him to give up Fronilde. This adds to the mystery for the Archbishop but not for the spectator, and has no value in any way. Finally, in scene 4 of Act IV, of the edition of 1844, and in scene 5 of Act IV, of the edition of 1869, Don Sancho tells Munio of Fronilde's innocence, but in the edition of 1869 a new scene is added, scene 6, in which the words of the Count corroborate the statement of Don Sancho, and after the speech of the Count, Don Sancho concludes the remarks of scene 4 of the edition of 1844.

Avellaneda, always devout, was even more occupied with the writing of religious poetry in the last five years of her life than ever before. This may explain the addition of the prayer of the Empress at the end of scene 6 of Act I.

A comparison of scene 2 of Act I, of the edition of 1844, with its equivalent, scene 5 of Act I, of the edition of 1869, shows a considerable difference in the character of Fronilde. In the edition of 1869 she is more reserved and self-sacrificing, and less prone to avow her love to Don Sancho. She restrains her feelings and her character is accordingly weakened.

Another important change is the shifting of scenes, or of parts of scenes, usually with the result of a closer knitting of the action. As mentioned above, scene 5 of Act I, of the edition of 1844, is given as scene 2 of Act I, of the edition of 1869.[22]

---

[22] See p. 42 of this paper.

Also mentioned above, were the cases where the entrance of the Count divided a passage that in the edition of 1844 was one.[23] In scene 2 of Act IV, of the edition of 1844, Munio reveals the tragedy to the Archbishop after which the latter offers to expiate the crime himself; then Munio tells the reason for doing what he has done. In the edition of 1869, all this takes place in scene 3 of Act IV, but in a different order. The Archbishop's prayer comes at the end of the scene, after Munio has told both of his crime and the reason that prompted him.

A noteworthy change in a descriptive passage is found in scene 3 of Act I, of the edition of 1869, which corresponds to scene 4 of Act I, of the edition of 1844. The Count is describing the return of Munio and his band; in the edition of 1869 the attention is centered on Munio alone and much of the color and detail of the original is lost.

Along with the general shortening there are considerable changes in wording, made for the most part in the interest of the meaning rather than the verse. Sometimes there seems to be a tendency toward more unusual words with an accompanying improvement in richness of rhythm; for example:

¡Llegó por fin el tan temido día . . . !
¡temido, sí, mas *decisivo* . . . !
—Act II, scene 6, ed. of 1844.

Hé aquí llegado el *crítico* momento
tan anhelado cual temido.
—Act II, scene 6, ed. of 1869.

¿Que *pena*
puede *turbaros* tanto?
—Act IV, scene 2, ed. of 1844.

¿Qué *grave idea*
puede *absorberos* tanto?
—Act IV, scene 5, ed. of 1869.

[23] See p. 45 of this paper.

¿bajo el *sagrado* manto de la Iglesia
te quisiste *cubrir?*
—Act IV, scene 4, ed. of 1844.

¿bajo el manto *inviolable* de la Iglesia
te quisiste *ocultar?*
—Act IV, scene 5, ed. of 1869.

At times, words are chosen which add to the detail and picturesqueness of the description; for example, in Munio's speech at the end of Act I:

El prado ameno de *colores* cambia
con el *caliente* y *abundante* riego.
—Ed. of 1844.

Se matizan del prado los *verdores*
con el *rojo* color que les da el riego.
—Ed. of 1869.

One change brings on another, and so the dropping of *caliente* and *abundante* in the line above possibly explains the change from *humeante* to *hirviente* in the line below:

y del Adoro los cristales fríos
con *humeante* licor corren revueltos.

y del Adoro los cristales fríos
con *hirviente* licor corren revueltos.

Likewise, *roja* having been used before is dropped in the following line:

Siembran despojos la llanura *roja.*

Siembran despojos la llanura *vasta.*

Often a word of little value is replaced by a word that is really appropriate; thus, in the following lines, *yace* is replaced by *fría*, and as *fría* conveys the idea of *helados*, the latter makes way for *sangriento*, which is an added element in the picture:

Acá una mano solitaria *yace*
que de la vida en el afán postrero
con crispatura tal asió la espada
que aun clava en ella los *helados* dedos.

Acá una mano solitaria y *fría*,
que, de la vida en el afán postrero
con crispatura tal asió la espada,
que aun clava en ella los *sangrientos* dedos.

These changes in words give evidence of a meticulous retouching, but the general improvement does not seem sufficient to justify the effort that such work must have cost.

The result of all the above-mentioned changes seems to be a loss of lyricism with a gain in dramatic effect, a loss in spontaneity with an increase in dignity, in a word, a lessening of the romantic elements with a definite tendency toward a classical treatment, but this is far from agreeing with Menéndez y Pelayo that the result of the recasting is a blunder.[24]

Príncipe de Viana (1844)

Three months after *Munio Alfonso*, Avellaneda produced another tragedy which for some unknown reason did not have the success that greeted her first play.

The story of the play as found in the edition of 1869 is as follows: On the death of the Queen of Navarre, her husband, Juan of Aragon, has usurped the throne to which her son, Don Carlos of Viana, was the rightful heir. Don Juan's second wife, the Queen Doña Enríquez, hates Don Carlos and wishes to place upon the throne her own son, Don Fernando. She persuades Don Juan that Don Carlos is in collusion with the King of Castile. Carlos comes to seek his father's favor and prove to him that he is not plotting against him, but he is cast into a tower of the castle of Aitona by the weak Don Juan. Isabel of Peralta, the daughter of Don Juan's Chancellor, is in love with Don Carlos and offers to help the Duke of Cardona and the Archbishop of Tarragona to save him. Troops from Castile

[24] Cf. Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 267.

and Catalonia advance on the castle to free Don Carlos. Don Juan and Doña Juana have fled to Saragossa whither the Chancellor has brought his prisoner, Don Carlos. The Queen realizes that her cause is lost, but she does not yield. She urges the Chancellor to poison Don Carlos. To ward off suspicion she persuades the weak King to pardon his son and set him free. The Queen begins to show her fear and cowardice; Isabel overhears her broken soliloquy in which she reveals her guilt. From Isabel's exclamations the King begins to guess the truth. The Chancellor arrives and announces the death of Don Carlos. The Queen falling on her knees asks the King's forgiveness which he refuses. Isabel, in a low tone, tells the Chancellor she knows of his crime but will not accuse him as he is her father. She seizes a dagger from his belt and kills herself.

Quintana had planned, and begun a play, *El Príncipe de Viana*, but his work was interrupted by the French Revolution and all that he had done was lost during the later invasion of the French armies into Spain. He never took the work up again,[25] but he did include the Prince of Viana among his famous *Vidas*, and Avellaneda, who was so familiar with the work of Quintana, could not have found a better source for material for her play. Indeed, the play in 1844 was dedicated to Quintana. Avellaneda's general familiarity with the history of Spain justifies the belief that she may also have known at first hand the works of Zurita, Mariana and Nicolás Antonio, all of which Quintana gives as his sources for his life of the Prince.

Besides the creation of the character of Isabel of Peralta, and the rôle she plays with respect to the Prince, the only variations from the facts of history are, as Avellaneda points out herself,[26] the definite attribution of the guilt of murder to the Queen, whereas in history this guilt was only a matter of rumor, and the complicity of the Chancellor Peralta, whereas in history there are not even any intimations of his connection with the crime.

In this play we again find the same mingling of classic and

---

[25] Cf. Quintana, preface to the *Duque de Viseo* and *Pelayo*, dated March 1, 1821, in *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, Madrid, 1867, Vol. 19, p. 42.

[26] Cf. dedication of play *A Fernán Caballero*, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 2, pp. 67–68.

romantic elements. The prison in the tower, the underground passage, the poisoning of the Prince, the curse of the King upon the guilty Queen, and in the edition of 1844, the curse of Isabel upon the Queen, are all romantic factors that are not found in *Munio Alfonso*. On the other hand, the characters of the weak-willed King and his strong-willed spouse are studies in motivation the like of which the romanticists never attempted.

In the character of the generous, humble and forgiving Prince, we have Avellaneda's ideal Christian, a type we shall often meet with later in her works.

Mitjans finds that the catastrophe does not surprise in the *Príncipe de Viana* because the crime is premeditated whereas in *Munio Alfonso* the catastrophe is brought about by a quick decision dictated by a sense of honor[27]; but if the crime is premeditated in the *Príncipe de Viana*, the tragedy is just as clearly foreshadowed in *Munio Alfonso* by the premonitions of Fronilde and the ominous threats of the storm, in scenes 2 and 3 of Act III (both versions). Moreover, because in the *Príncipe de Viana* the catastrophe comes at the very end, the play is not open to the criticism that was made of *Munio Alfonso* that the interest falls off in the last act.[28] The *Príncipe de Viana* has also been criticized for lacking a great figure who epitomized the spirit of an epoch as did Munio,[29] but this is certainly not a necessary condition for great tragedy, not even in Spain where nationalistic considerations in literature seem to have more weight than elsewhere. On the other hand, Salvador Salazar prefers the *Príncipe de Viana* because it is more human and more probable, and portrays characters that are real and living.[30]

Avellaneda at first intended to omit this play from the *Colección completa*, and this because of scruples for having attributed guilt to the Queen and the Chancellor which had no certainty in historic fact. It was only on the insistence of Fernán Caballero that she deigned to reproduce it after having improved it as

---

[27] Cf. Aurelio Mitjans, *Historia de la literatura cubana*, Madrid, 1918, p. 307.
[28] Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 267.
[29] Cf. Aurelio Castillo de González, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
[30] Salvador Salazar, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

much as possible.[31] Now, this "improvement" is in general similar to the changes we found in the recasting of *Munio Alfonso*.

The edition of 1844 was in four acts. In the edition of 1869 practically the whole first act was omitted, except for scene 6 between the Duke of Cardona and Isabel, which was the basis for scene 13 of Act I of the edition of 1869. The first act of the edition of 1844 begins with a scene of the King before the Cortes, the Archbishop of Tarragona being spokesman for the latter. The King obliges the Archbishop to read before the Cortes a letter he (the King) has received from Fadrique Enríquez, the Almirante of Castile, informing him of a secret agreement existing between Enrique IV of Castile, and the Prince of Viana. After the King and the Chancellor leave, the Prince arrives and tells the Cortes that to them alone he looks for hope and protection since the death of his uncle, Alfonso V, King of Aragon. Now all this served the sole purpose of exposition, and Avellaneda was able to suppress it by using scene 1 of Act II (which became scene 1 of Act I in the edition of 1869) in its stead, and thus unify the action of the play. In the edition of 1844 this was a short scene between the King and the Chancellor; in the edition of 1869 it is a fairly long scene between the Queen and the Chancellor.

The relationship between the Prince and Isabel is ill-defined in both versions. The vast difference in their social positions would not allow for love and marriage. Yet, in romantic fashion, this love is mentioned in the earlier version. Scene 6 of Act I referred to above as changed to scene 13 of the new Act I, of the edition of 1869, was considerably altered in the later version. Isabel is offering her services in behalf of the Prince to the Duke of Cardona. The latter doubts her sincerity, and to prove it she replies, in the edition of 1844:

> no veo en él al príncipe infelice . . .
> miro a mi bien . . . mi Dios . . . ¡duque, le amo!

This confession of love is wholly lacking in the edition of 1869,

[31] *Obras literarias*, Vol. 2, pp. 67, 68.

and Isabel vaguely explains her interest in the Prince's fate as arising from

un sentimiento ignoto, omnipotente, etc.

And is it not insinuated that the Prince is thinking of love and marriage when he says of Isabel (Act IV, scene 12 of the edition of 1844):

. . . que es capaz de tan heroico esfuerzo
que en su sublime frente la diadema,
que Blanca de Navarra ciñó un día
con mayor majestad brillar se viera . . . ?

But in the later version, the Prince's words are much more impersonal (Act III, scene 13):

¡Guardadla, canciller, como un tesoro,
que hará dichoso a aquel que lo posea! . . .

However, the impossibility of such a union is indicated in the rather Dantesque scene in which the Prince gives to Isabel his mother's ring (Act III, scene 4 of the edition of 1844). Isabel says:

Volarán juntas
al cielo nuestras almas: si en la tierra
las separaba un trono, cuando le hunda
la mano de la muerte, y en la losa
de la regia y humilde sepultura,
el santo dogma de igualdad se lea . . .
¡entonces juntas al empíreo suban,
y beban del raudal de los amores
que nunca el mundo con su cieno enturvia!

In the edition of 1869 (Act II, scene 8), the same point is made but the tone is much more restrained:

De rodillas don tan alto
me toca recibir, y mi alma os jura
que amante y fiel la encontrará la vuestra,
cuando a encontraros al empíreo suba.

The motivation of the character of the Chancellor is better

done in the version of 1869; in the edition of 1844 he does not discover Isabel with the Prince in the room in the tower. By inventing this situation in which the Chancellor erroneously judges his daughter guilty, Avellaneda lessens the guilt of the Chancellor himself by furnishing an intimate personal motive for his crime. The following contrast of the Chancellor's words reveals the added motivation; in scene 6 of Act III of the edition of 1844, the Chancellor says:

> Muy dura
> es esa obligación, mas en cumplirla
> no puedo vacilar;

whereas in scene 2 of Act III of the edition of 1869 he exclaims:

> pero del noble
> la generosa sangre se subleva
> contra venganza tal . . . aunque del padre
> el ultrajado corazón la acepta.
> ¿No es justo pague ese hombre mi deshonra,
> pues débil soy con la culpable hembra
> que aborrecer no puedo?
> . . . . . .
> que a su aspecto
> crece y se aviva, cual horrible hoguera,
> mi reprimida saña, que al vil crimen—
> que aun rechaza mi honor—quizás me impela.

This new situation contains reminiscences of the plot of *Munio Alfonso*.

Scenes 12 and 13 of Act IV of the edition of 1844 became scenes 13 and 14 of Act III of the edition of 1869; the Prince now free but secretly poisoned takes leave of the Queen, and after his departure, Isabel overhears the Queen's soliloquy and thus learns of the crime; turning on the Queen she calls her an assassin. The Queen informs Isabel of her father's complicity and Isabel faints; the Queen thinking her dead, cries out:

> ¡Muerta . . . !
> . . . los muertos no acusan. . . .
> . . . . . ¡yo he vencido!

Now in the edition of 1869, although Isabel faints, we have no reason to believe her dead, and the cry, "yo he vencido" loses the force it had in the earlier version. The vivid emotion of this rapid discourse is changed almost to cold formality. On the other hand, the last scene, where the Queen falls on her knees and cries: "¡Perdón!", although more difficult for the actress, is more emotional and more realistic than the somewhat rhetorical cry of madness:

> ¡Sombra sangrienta!
> ¿Qué me quieres . . . ? ¡Aparta! ¿Por qué el pecho
> entre tus brazos de metal me aprietas?

The effect of this simplification in wording is very much like that of scene 2 of Act III of *Munio Alfonso*.[32]

In the edition of 1844 the play ends with Isabel's curse upon the Queen, whereas in the edition of 1869, Isabel stabs herself with the dagger she snatches from her father's belt.

As in *Munio Alfonso* there is considerable loss of lyricism in the later version. The most noteworthy example of this is in scenes 1 and 2 of Act II which were scenes 1 and 2 of Act III in the edition of 1844. Scene 1 is a soliloquy in which the unhappy Prince, imprisoned in the lonely tower seeks consolation in the recollection of his mother. In scene 2, on the unexpected appearance of Isabel, the Prince's musings continue in a long series of rhetorical questions as to who the newcomer is, whether she is an angel, his mother's spirit, etc. In the edition of 1869, the soliloquy is made much shorter and much less fanciful, while the questions of the second scene are reduced to the following:

> ¿desciende por ventura
> el ángel que soñaba en mis delirios? . . .
> ¡Misteriosa visión! dime quién eres.

A review of these comparisons shows in the later version a further unification of action, a weakening of the love theme, a greater motivation of character, a tendency toward terseness in expression and a great decrease in lyricism.

---

[32] Cf. p. 43 of this paper.

Egilona (1845)

Avellaneda wrote still another *drama trágico*. This play, *Egilona*, she did not deem good enough to recast and include in the *Colección completa*.[33] It is divided into three acts the last of which is subdivided into two *cuadros* of six and five scenes respectively.

After the Gothic King Rodrigo had disappeared in battle, his wife, Egilona, married the Moorish Emir Abdalasis. The Emir being kindly disposed toward the Christians, had freed all the Christian captives but three, and at Egilona's solicitation decided that they too should be free. They are brought before Abdalasis. One of them in defiant tone makes himself known as Rodrigo and is flung back into the dungeon. In the meantime, a faction of Moors, partly out of lust for power, and partly out of opposition to Abdalasis' friendliness toward the Christians, rebel against him and plan the death of Egilona. Abdalasis is killed and Egilona predicting the ultimate triumph of Christianity, stabs herself before the victorious rebels can reach her. Rodrigo survives.

That Egilona married Abdalasis is vouched for in history,[34] but there is no historical evidence of the captivity of Rodrigo, and the only report of his survival after the battle is his three-day penance in the tomb, after which he died, as told in the chronicle of Pedro del Corral.[35] The survival of Rodrigo which we have in *Egilona* was probably suggested by Quintana's *Pelayo*. Egilona thought her husband dead as Hormesinda thought her brother dead. Each felt that the cause of the Christians was lost, and each had used her influence with a Moorish chief to mitigate the harshness of her compatriots' subjugation. This historical similarity is even referred to in *Pelayo* (Act I, scene 1) where Veremundo defending Hormesinda's proposed marriage, says:

> Mira a la hermosa viuda de Rodrigo
> Ganar desde su triste cautiverio
> El corazón del joven Abdalasis,
> Y ser su esposa, y ocupar su lecho.

---

[33] Cf. Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 2, p. 212, note 1.

[34] Cf. Latin Chronicle of Isidoro Pacence, in *España Sagrada*, Vol. 8, p. 303.

[35] Cf. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Antología de poetas líricos castellanos*, Madrid, 1890–1908, Vol. XI, pp. 166, 167.

But Pelayo is not dead and after Hormesinda sees him in a vision, he appears and chides her for her marriage. Then Manuza casts Pelayo into prison from which Hormesinda sets him free. Likewise Egilona has a vision of Rodrigo; later when she really sees him, she thinks it is the vision again; and when Rodrigo learns of her marriage, he denounces her for her faithlessness. Abdalasis casts Rodrigo back into a dungeon and later Egilona sets him free. Both plays end with the death of the Moor and his unhappy bride while the Spanish hero survives. A curious similarity is found in the passages where immediately after the marriage both Hormesinda and Egilona wish to be left alone for meditation. Hormesinda says:

> mas *consiente ahora*
> *que solo un buen rato, recogida,*
> tu esposa pueda contemplar su suerte,
> acallar los temores que la *agitan*, etc.
> —*Pelayo*, Act II, scene 1.

while Egilona says:

> y fatigada
> de tanta *agitación* el alma mía
> necesita reposo, y lo demanda
> a tu ternura, a tu bondad. *Permite*
> *que algunas horas logre retirada* . . .
> —*Egilona*, Act I, scene 3.

The rôle of national hero is much less important than in *Pelayo*, although we find the theme of *Munio Alfonso* in Rodrigo's words:

> ¡yo me quiero vengar asesinando . . . !
> ¡así las faltas de mi vida borro!
> ¡así soy español! ¡así cristiano![36]

The character of the Moor is considerably subdued: while the fierce Manuza kills Hormesinda, Abdalasis magnanimously resigns Egilona to Rodrigo and sets the latter free. Abdalasis has the generous character of the Príncipe de Viana; he reminds

[36] *Egilona*, Act III, *cuadro* 1, scene 2.

us of Chateaubriand's Aben-Hamet, but while the latter remained true to his religion, Abdalasis is a sort of eighteenth century rationalist who worships a God

> que acoge grato los sinceros votos
> con cualquier culto que le son rendidos.[37]

It has been said that the tragic *dénouement* of this play is not adequately motivated and that the argument is better suited for drama than for tragedy.[38] There is a certain element of truth in this criticism, but the cause of this weakness lies deeper, in the failure to produce a study of guilt and penitence as in the characters of Munio and the Queen, Doña Juana.

The meter throughout is the *romance heroico*.

Saúl (1849)

Although the biblical drama, *Saúl* was written in 1846, it was not played until three years later.[39] Avellaneda tells us that after having read Alfieri's *Saul* (1782), and another play of the same name by Alexandre Soumet (1822),[40] she began to translate the latter into Spanish.[41] Being obliged to give up this translation in order to work on the three original tragedies we have already examined, she never finished the translation but wrote an original play on the same subject.[42]

As written in 1846, the play was in five acts. By cutting it down to four acts at the suggestion of several friends in 1849, she was obliged to omit some good scenes, but this loss was compensated by the gain in brevity. She was not, however,

---

[37] Ibid., Act I, scene 6.

[38] José A. Rodríguez García, *op. cit.*, pp. 376, 377.

[39] Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 2, p. 214.

[40] Lamartine began a *Saül* in 1812 which Talma pronounced "injouable"; (cf. Emile Deschanel, *Lamartine*, Paris, pp. 57 and 59). It was never published, but two excerpts are found among Lamartine's lyric poetry, one entitled *La mort de Jonathas* in the *Harmonies*, the other entitled *Fragment biblique* in the *Recueillements poétiques*.

[41] Soumet's *Saül* was again edited in 1845 without any variations from the original version. After Soumet's death the play was adapted as a libretto in three acts by Félicien Mallefille for Mermet's opera entitled *David*, which was first played in June, 1846. Inasmuch as Avellaneda read her play before the Liceo of Madrid in the month of March of the same year, this operatic version could not have influenced her choice of the subject.

[42] Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 2, p. 212.

willing to accede to the suggestion to omit Samuel's death and the apparition of his ghost.[43]

Alfieri's play, although extending through five acts, deals simply with the defeat of the Israelites at Gilboa. David has returned to the camp of Saul in order to defend his country, in spite of Saul's hostility to him. After a scene between David and his wife Michal, the daughter of Saul, David meets Saul himself and proves his guiltlessness by showing the piece of Saul's cloak that he had cut in the cave at En-gedi instead of taking his life. Saul is convinced and all rejoice at the reconciliation, but David's song of war provokes Saul's jealousy and he is forced to flee. The real struggle between royalty and priesthood is brought out in the scene between Abner and the high priest Ahimelech when the latter is led away to be killed (Act IV, scene 4). David, now realizing that Saul can no longer look for divine assistance, leaves him to his fate. Abner tells Saul his sons have been killed, and just before the Philistines arrive upon the scene, Saul kills himself.

Most of this is in accordance with the Bible story as told in the first Book of Samuel, with the following exceptions: that the priest Ahimelech had been killed long before this time, that there is no account of Michal having followed her father to the camp, and that no mention is made of Abner's presence at the battle, although as leader of Saul's army he was probably there.[44]

Although Soumet says in his preface to *Saül*, "La lutte du sacerdoce et de la royauté n'avait été offerte au théâtre qu'une seule fois, dans *Athalie*, etc.," it might seem as if he knew Alfieri's *Saul* for as we shall see, he made, among many other variations in the biblical story, all the changes found in Alfieri's version.

Soumet's play begins with events that according to the biblical story took place long before the battle of Gilboa. The Israelites are threatened with destruction by the giant Goliath. David slays him. Saul is appraised of David's exploit by Jonathan and Michal. Ahimelech appears in chains and tells

---

[43] Avellaneda, *Nota* to *Saúl*, Madrid, 1849, p. 11.
[44] Cf. N. Scarano, *Da Dante al Leopardi*, Milano, 1904, p. 485.

of Samuel's prophecy of Saul's downfall, but refuses to divulge who the shepherd is who shall succeed him. Saul decides to learn this by consulting the Pythoness of Endor. David and Michal are in love, and Saul, having been unable to get information from the Pythoness and being reconciled by David's singing, offers his daughter to David in marriage and presents him with a golden helmet. He urges David to help him fight against his unknown rival. The Pythoness again arouses Saul's suspicions and tells him that the shepherd who is to succeed him according to Samuel's prophecy is David; thus is Saul tempted to enter Samuel's tomb. The ghost of Samuel confirms the declaration of the Pythoness, and Saul being cast from the tomb, orders David to be hanged to a cross. The Philistines make an attack. Jonathan and David exchanging their helmets and shields as a token of eternal friendship, go forth against the enemy. Saul sets out to kill David and recognizing the helmet he had bestowed upon him, kills his own son. Thus seeing the accomplishment of Samuel's prophecy, he kills himself in the midst of victory.

Soumet has added a great deal to Alfieri's simple story. He has made all the changes Alfieri made to the biblical version, along with many others. The most noteworthy of the latter are: (*a*) Saul's utter ignorance of the existence of David until after the killing of Goliath, and his notion that Jonathan had done this deed; (*b*) the ironical situation of Saul asking David to help him find and overcome the unknown rival for his throne; (*c*) the exchange of helmets by David and Jonathan with the consequent slaying of the latter by Saul himself; (*d*) the blindness of Ahimelech, his relating to Saul the prophecy of Samuel, and his ultimate survival, uttering the last words of the play which announce the coming of Christ from the line of David; (*e*) the victory of the Israelites. Moreover, the character of Abner is changed from an ardent abetter of Saul's hatred of the priesthood in Alfieri to a horrified observer of his king's sacrilege.

Saul's reconciliation to David is not so well motivated as in Alfieri's play on account of the omission of the episode of the clipping of Saul's cloak. On the other hand, the motivation of Saul's subsequent reaction against David is much better

accomplished by the introduction of the episode of the consultation with the Pythoness of Endor. On the whole, Alfieri's play is better motivated and is much more realistic. There is an attempt to analyze and explain the insanity of Saul; Jonathan says:

> Il rio demon, che fero
> Gl'invasa il cor, brevi di tregua istanti
> Lascia a Saulle almen; *ma d'Abner l'arte*
> *Nol lascia mai.*[45]

Whereas Soumet's Saul is a victim of inexplicable *états d'âme*, fainting spells and maledictions. In Soumet's play there is a definite romantic tendency in the stress on the supernatural—the witch "en pacte avec les ombres,"[46] the tomb "qui vomit des flammes,"[47] the communion with the dead, the numerous prophecies that are ultimately fulfilled, etc.

Alfieri's Saul is at odds with the priesthood; Soumet's Saul is at war with God Himself whom he calls

> cette aveugle puissance
> qui frappe en même temps le crime et l'innocence.[48]

Both plays adhere to the unities; Alfieri's adheres to the unity of time by limiting the action to the last few hours of Saul's life, Soumet's, by crowding the events of several years into the space of twenty-four hours.[49]

Between 1822 and 1846 romanticism had come and gone, and one of its permanent accomplishments had been the subversion of the authority of the unities. Avellaneda takes advantage of this freedom and disregards the unities of time[50] and of place.

The first act of Avellaneda's play takes place in a square of the city of Gilgal. Ahimelech announces to Samuel the victory of the Israelites over the Amalekites. David approaches sing-

---

[45] Alfieri, *Saul*, Act I, scene 2.
[46] Soumet, *Saül*, Act I, scene 2.
[47] *Ibid.*, Act IV, scene 6.
[48] *Ibid.*, Act V, scene 8.
[49] Cf. Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 2, p. 213.
[50] *Ibid.*

ing, and meets Michal. Saul arrives with Agag, the king of the Amalekites, and the many spoils of victory. Ahimelech chides Saul for not obeying the divine commands to slay Agag and take no booty.[51] He, accordingly, refuses to offer up part of the booty in sacrifices. Saul makes the sacrifices himself but is warned by Samuel of the wrath of Heaven. As Samuel is about to leave, Saul snatches at his cloak and tears it, but Samuel departs unharmed taking Agag along with him. Michal and Jonathan in consternation are consoled by David.

The place of Act II is the camp of the Israelites in the valley of Terebinth. Michal has come there with David and hopes that David's singing will temper Saul's madness. The Israelites are threatened by Goliath. David offers to fight him. Saul ponders the words of the prophet and wonders who the rival to his throne can be. David slays Goliath and Saul asks David to help him fight his unknown rival.

The scene of Act III is a room of the royal palace. Preparations are being made for the wedding of David and Michal. Abner announces to Saul the approaching death of Samuel at Ramah. A messenger from Ramah arrives and tells of Samuel's latest prophecies; he says that Saul's successor is a youthful Bethlehemite already in their midst. Abner points out that this is certainly David; thereupon, Saul orders Abner to kill David. Jonathan arrives and tells Saul that the marriage of David and Michal has just been consummated. Michal rushes in and tells of Abner's attack on David; then Abner comes and tells Saul how David has escaped within the temple. Ahimelech has given David the sword of Goliath, and by order of Saul all the priests of Nob are slain. Samuel supported by the Holy Ghost comes from Ramah to warn Saul to give up his crown. As Saul is about to strike him, he falls dead. Saul now realizes that his struggle is not only against the priesthood but against Heaven itself, so he decides to consult the Pythoness of Endor, the agent of the Devil.

In Act IV David returns from his wanderings to the camp of the Israelites at Gilboa, where he finds Michal and Jonathan.

---

[51] Cf. *First Book of Samuel*, chapter 15, verses 9, 10 and 11.

He and Jonathan exchange helmets as a token of friendship. Saul consults the Pythoness to find out where David is; he sees a vision of Samuel and learns that his end is close at hand. Recognizing the helmet he had given David, he strikes and kills his own son Jonathan; he then kills himself as the Israelites win the battle.

Avellaneda has made all the changes in the biblical version that Alfieri made.[52] She has also adopted many of the changes made by Soumet: (*a*) Saul asking David to find his unknown rival; (*b*) the exchange of helmets by David and Jonathan; (*c*) the survival of Ahimelech, and his prophetic words;[53] (however, he is not blind); (*d*) the final victory of the Israelites.

The action of Avellaneda's play begins with events which took place much earlier than the events of Soumet's play. In Alfieri's play the element of divine opposition to Saul is lacking. In Soumet's play, this hostility to Saul is explained as a result of his dealings with the evil Pythoness and his slaughter of the priests.[54] Avellaneda, by going back to the episode of Saul's victory over the Amalekites, his saving the life of Agag, and his offering up sacrifices himself after the priests refused to do so, offers the biblical motive for the divine opposition to Saul.

The arrival of David at the camp of Gilboa (Act IV, scene 1) is in a general way based on Alfieri's play (Act I, scenes 1 and 2). In many ways Avellaneda improves this episode, *e. g.*, in Alfieri, when Jonathan and David meet, they talk for some time about Saul's madness, the treachery of Abner, etc., before the name of Michal is mentioned and then it is Jonathan who first speaks of her (Act I, scene 2); in Avellaneda's version, as soon as David and Jonathan recognize each other, David's first words are: "¿y Micol, Jonathas?"

By lengthening the time of the action of the play, Avellaneda is likewise enabled to introduce Samuel as one of the *dramatis personæ*. Thus we hear the prophecies of Samuel from his own lips instead of through the words of the high priest, Ahimelech.

---

[52] Cf. p. 58 of this paper.

[53] This alteration did not exist in the original version of 1846 for the character of Abiathar played the rôle he did in the Bible, being suppressed in the revision of 1849; cf. *Obras literarias*, Vol. 2, p. 215.

[54] Soumet, *Saül*, Act I, scene 2.

The subsequent arrival of Samuel alive but with a "corpse-like expression," and sustained by the Holy Ghost, after he was reported dying at Ramah, may have been suggested to Avellaneda by the *sombra de Samuel* in José M. Heredia's translation of Alfieri's *Saul*.[55] This scene in Avellaneda's play takes the place of Saul's entrance at the behest of the Pythoness into the tomb of the prophet, as devised in Soumet's play; but Avellaneda seemed still desirous of using the episode of the Pythoness, and so she makes Saul consult the witch, not with regard to the identity of his rival, for this he has learned from Samuel, but as to the whereabouts of David. In Soumet's play, Saul asks Abner to help him kill David: "Viens, Abner, de David surveillons le trépas."[56] Avellaneda carried out this suggestion to the extent of having Abner attack David. The latter flees to the temple for safety where he receives the sword of Goliath, but this is an anachronism, as in the biblical version the flight to the temple and the gift of the sword took place before the death of Samuel. Avellaneda's Abner is made up of elements taken from both Alfieri and Soumet. Although he is less conniving than Alfieri's Abner, he makes remarks that contribute greatly to Saul's antagonism to David,[57] but he does not share Saul's opposition to God for he makes the following distinction:

> Los sacerdotes son, que no el Eterno,
> Quienes te inculpan y rencor te guardan.
> Act III, scene 4.

Avellaneda omits the phase of Saul's temporary reconciliation

---

[55] Heredia's translation was begun in 1823 but not completed until 1835; cf. Heredia's *Advertencia*. The play and the *Advertencia* were published in the *Revista de Cuba*, Havana, 1880, Vol. VII. Heredia adheres closely to Alfieri's version except in the first four scenes of Act V, where he introduces the Pythoness and the *sombra de Samuel*. This ghost is based on Saul's soliloquy in scene 3 of Act V of Alfieri's play; in this soliloquy, Saul merely addresses a figment of his own diseased brain; in Heredia's translation, this figment is projected into a speaking and acting appearance on the stage; in Avellaneda's play Samuel is a real person appearing through divine intervention.

[56] Soumet, *Saül*, Act IV, scene 6.

[57] Cf. especially Act III, scene 7:

> **Abner:** **confabulados**
> Están Samuel y el Belemita hipócrita,

which, cf. Alfieri's *Saul*, Act II, scene 1:

> ma servo appieno ei sempre
> di Samuello; etc.

with David. This change is an improvement, as the reconciliation interferes with the logical development of the plot. It has another significance too; Avellaneda is more interested than Soumet in the progressive steps of Saul's strife with God. At the beginning of Soumet's play, Saul is already damned by his traffic with the witch; the plot is chiefly concerned with the process of Saul's discovery that David is the predicted rival to his throne. In Avellaneda's play, Saul's guilt begins as mere avarice and disobedience, which lead to the struggle with the priesthood and this struggle in turn leads to his open defiance of God. Avellaneda's character of Saul is a study in the desperate remedies of a man who has sinned and does not repent, who has lost his faith and wanders farther and farther astray into ungodliness.

In spite of a greater number of episodic departures from the biblical version, when we consider that the disregard of the unities of time and space made possible the inclusion of early and basic phases of the story along with a diminution in the number of chronological discrepancies, we are compelled to agree with Avellaneda that her play is "más rigorosamente histórico que el de Soumet"[58]; and although the dramatic action seems predetermined by the limitations of a definite theological postulate, still the rapidity and the humanness of the dialogue, along with the absence of declamation, oblige us to conclude with Avellaneda that her Saul is "más dramático que el de Alfieri."[59] Furthermore, it is biblical, which is not true of its pseudo-classical antecedents. It is pervaded by the spirit of the Old Testament, especially of the Psalms; it is rendered in simple and melodious verse; in every way it bears the impress of Avellaneda's originality.[60]

The metre of *Saúl* is almost entirely the *romance heroico*. A few other verse-forms are found in the songs and prayers, viz.: six, seven and eight syllable *octavillas italianas*, and a few *silvas* and *cuartetos*.

[58] *Advertencia o prólogo* to *Saúl* in *Obras literarias*, Vol. 2, p. 214.

[59] *Ibid.*

[60] When Menéndez y Pelayo says that the chief beauties of *Saúl* are inspired by the Bible rather than by Alfieri or Soumet he is, doubtless, referring to the pious lyrical strain that runs throughout the play. Cf. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia*, Vol. 1 p. 266, note 1.

The play is included in the *Colección completa* with many changes. The love of David and Michal is much more fully developed than in the earlier version; it is interwoven throughout the whole tissue of the play. David's rôle is, accordingly, more important and he appears more frequently on the stage. Thus a song of David (in *silvas*, based in part on Psalm 104, verses 1, 2 and 3) is added in scene 2 of Act I, and a new scene (scene 12) is annexed at the end of Act I, in which David enters and gives consolation to Michal. Furthermore, in Act IV of the original version, David does not meet Michal at the camp although we find her there in company with the priest, Ahimelech. Now, in the final version, David and Michal meet in scenes 3 and 4 of Act IV. These are entirely new scenes and are based directly on scenes 3 and 4 of Act I of Alfieri's play. Avellaneda has thus modified the first four scenes of Act IV to conform to the love episode as rendered by Alfieri in the first four scenes of Act I. This episode is further improved by transferring to scene 2 the lyrical passage spoken by Michal, which Avellaneda did not get from Alfieri or Soumet, and which in the original edition is found in scene 5.

No play is found in the final edition with so many changes in wording as *Saúl*. In scene 5 of Act I, *justa guerra* is changed to *lid sangrienta*, and *rostro descubierto* in scene 7 of Act II is changed to *rostro despejado* in the equivalent scene 6 of Act II of the final edition. From these and many similar changes one might expect to find the same general tendency, discovered in *Munio Alfonso* to use more unusual words in the recasting; but in *Saúl* too many cases are found where common words replace words of more elevated usage,[61] to permit us to demonstrate a similar tendency.

Hence, we are obliged to conclude that except for the parts added to emphasize the love episode, most of the alterations in the final version of *Saúl* are inconsequential. Although they have done no harm to the play, they have certainly not improved it in any way commensurate with the effort made.

---

[61] E. g., *nefanda estirpe* changed to *ominosa raza*, Act I, scene 1, both editions.

Recaredo (1851)

Avellaneda abandons the severity of tragedy in her next play *Flavio Recaredo*, a love story set amidst the events of the fall of the power of the Swabians in Spain, and the unification of the Catholic faith under the Gothic king, Recaredo. In the edition of 1851 the time is given as "588 or 589." The fall of Leuvigildo occurred in 586.[62]

The characters of the play are practically the same as represented in history,[63] with the exception of Bada; it is true Recaredo was married to a certain Bada but she was probably a Goth, instead of a Swabian as represented by Avellaneda.[64] The Bada of the play is original with Avellaneda; in her profound melancholy and in her deep religious faith at times reaching a sublime exaltation, she is Avellaneda herself. The magnanimity of the Recaredo of history[65] is even excelled in Avellaneda's Recaredo. He is another example of the generous prince we found in Carlos of Viana and Abdalasis.

According to history there were two conspiracies, one headed by the Arian prelate Sunna against the Archbishop Mausona and the Duke Claudio, the other, by the chamberlain Argimundo against Recaredo.[66] Avellaneda simply joins these two conspiracies into one without doing violence to the essential facts. The chief difference is in the methods of punishment of the unsuccessful criminals. In the case of the first conspiracy, the property of all the members was confiscated to the public funds; the leader, Sunna, was exiled to Africa; another had his hands cut off and likewise was exiled; a certain Vacrila, who had taken sanctuary in the Church of Santa Olalla was ordered to remain there the rest of his life in the service of his protector. The only one pardoned was Witerico, and this because of the warning he had given. In the case of the second conspiracy, Argimundo, whose hair had been cut off—a token of dishonor among both Goths and Swabians—was led through the streets

---

[62] Cf. Mariana, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 215.
[63] *Ibid.*, pp. 218, 219.
[64] *Ibid.*, p. 209.
[65] *Ibid.*, p. 224.
[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 218, 219.

on a donkey to be jeered at by the populace and was later decapitated; all his accomplices were killed.[67]

In the play, Sunna was exiled to Africa; the penalty of Vacrila is mentioned although not his name; Agrimundo's hair was cut and he was led through the streets on a donkey, but was not killed; and all the rest of the conspirators were pardoned.[68] Viterico was not even incriminated, as he withdrew before the conspiracy took definite shape. These changes were a concession of Avellaneda to her heroic ideal. Yet, although the penalties lost their rigor, the clemency is not so extreme as that of Corneille's Auguste or so improbable as that of Don Carlos in *Hernani*.

As Avellaneda's character of Bada is her own creation, so is the love episode and its relation to the conspiracy her own invention. The separation of two lovers by a difference of religion recalls the similar situation of the *Aventures du dernier Abencerage*, and Bada's vow to enter a convent because of this separation recalls the vow of Leonor in *El Trovador*, but Avellaneda avoided the romantic intensity of the *dénouements* of both these stories. Recaredo is converted to Catholicism, and Bada is released by the Church from her vow.

The play ends with the prophecy, in the manner of Virgil, of Spain carrying the Cross to the New World. It is no longer merely in the name of Christianity and of national tradition that Avellaneda sings, she has now become the avowed champion of the Church:

> Iglesia romana
> —Unica, santa, divina . . .[69]

In this play Avellaneda departed from the exclusive use of the *romance heroico* and adopted a great variety of verse-forms. Besides the *romance heroico*, we find *versos de romance*, *quintillas*, *redondillas*, *octavas reales*, and in part of scene 1 of Act I a nine syllable verse assonanced in *a aguda*.

---

[67] *Ibid.*, pp. 218, 219.
[68] *Recaredo*, Act II, scenes 12 and 13.
[69] *Ibid.*, Act I, scene 2.

The version of the *Colección completa* except for the dropping of the word *Flavio* of the title is the same as the original.

La verdad vence apariencias (1852)

In her preface to *La verdad vence apariencias*, Avellaneda tells us that she borrowed part of the argument of the play from Byron's *Werner*. Byron's tragedy was based almost entirely on the novel entitled *The German's Tale Kruitzner*, written by Harriet Lee; it was one of the novels Miss Lee and her sister Sophia wrote and published under the title of *Lee's Canterbury Tales* (1797–1805). The name of the novel and the fact that the action of Byron's play takes place in Silesia at the end of the Thirty Years' War are the obvious reasons for the misunderstanding through which Avellaneda referred to Miss Lee as "una señorita alemana."

Werner, the protagonist of Byron's tragedy, has been disinherited and cursed by his father for his debauchery as a youth. He and his wife Josephine have taken refuge in a deserted castle. Their only hope in life is to find their lost son Ulric. Count Stralenheim, a distant relative, is eager to lay hold on Werner in order to get rid of a possible obstacle to his own plans to seize the estate that should rightfully devolve to Werner. While on a journey he is saved from drowning and brought to the old castle to spend the night. The needy Werner robs him. Gabor, the man who along with Ulric had saved the Count's life, is suspected of the theft; Werner helps him escape by showing him a secret passage-way. This same night the Count is murdered. Gabor is again suspected but has fled.

In less than a year Werner comes into his own and is now Count Siegendorf. His son Ulric is to be married to Ida Stralenheim, daughter of the murdered Count. Gabor appears on the scene and tells how from the secret passage-way he saw Ulric commit the murder. In order that his guilt may not become further known, Ulric wishes to kill Gabor but Siegendorf arranges his escape; and Ulric abandons father, mother and sweetheart to seek safety at the head of his band of outlaws who have been pillaging the country.

Avellaneda puts this story in a Spanish setting and makes several changes in the plot. The only important historical material she uses is Enrique II's flight after the battle of Nájera and his subsequent accession to power. While Byron's play is written in five acts, Avellaneda has divided hers into a prologue and two acts. The time of the prologue, which corresponds to the first three acts of Byron's play, is the night after the battle of Nájera. Just as Siegendorf conceals his identity under the name of Werner, Don Álvaro is known as Beltrán in the old castle where he has taken refuge with his son Rodrigo. He has an elder son who was kidnapped in infancy. Don Álvaro's pursuer is not merely a distant relative but his own elder brother, Don Tello. The latter has been wounded in the battle whence he is rescued and brought to this same castle by a youth, Fernán, of obscure birth. Don Tello wishes to have Fernán at his side to care for him through the night. This same night a soldier of the defeated army of Enrique II comes to the castle for shelter; Beltrán allows him to hide in an underground passage. During the night Don Tello is murdered.

The two acts of the play correspond to Acts IV and V of Byron's play; the time is 1370, three years after the battle of Nájera. Fortune has turned in favor of Enrique II, and through the death of Don Tello, Don Álvaro and his son Rodrigo are in possession of their inheritance. Rodrigo is to be married to Leonor, the daughter of Don Tello, and the King is to attend the wedding. Leonor is in love with Fernán who has found out that he belongs to her family and the couple fear they are brother and sister, but Don Álvaro recognizes Fernán as his elder son Gonzalo. Rodrigo discovering that Fernán is his rival, charges him with the murder of Don Tello. The King arrives; Don Álvaro recognizes him as the fugitive warrior he had led to the underground passage, and whom he suspected of killing Don Tello. However, the King explains how, when he was in the passage, he saw Rodrigo kill Don Tello. Thus Fernán is absolved and joined to his sweetheart, and the guilty Rodrigo is ordered by the King to seek expiation by fighting the Portuguese and the Moor.

It is curious to note the different moral points of view in the three versions of the story. In Harriet Lee's tale, a father has committed theft and justifies his act in the eyes of his son on the grounds of expediency. Later the father finds his son trying to justify murder on the same grounds. In Byron's story the guilt of the father is less important. The son is a sort of superman who knows no fear and who has "done with right and wrong."[70] When we have finished the play, we are not quite sure whether he is Byron's villain or his hero, but this outcome did not satisfy Avellaneda's sense of Christian justice, nor her sense of moral distinctions; she says, ". . . el poeta no dice nada del castigo que la justicia del cielo debió dar al bandido sanguinario, etc."[71] That justice might be done, she resorted to the manner of expiation already used in *Munio Alfonso*. This is probably the most important change she made; it was facilitated by the use of the King as witness of the crime and dispenser of justice, replacing the rôle of the obscure Gabor. In order that her play might have the desired moral ending, the thievery of the father is omitted, the whole guilt is placed on the son, and a conventional hero is introduced in the new character Gonzalo, the elder son of Don Álvaro. Ulric was too complicated for Avellaneda's comprehension; so she analyzes him into two simple elements, Rodrigo and Gonzalo. Gonzalo is endowed with all the virtues of Ulric while all his vices are imputed to Rodrigo. It is thus that Gonzalo's rescue of Don Tello from battle is based on Ulric's saving Stralenheim from drowning. Gonzalo also takes part of the rôle of Gabor in being suspected of the crime along with the fugitive soldier. This addition of the character of Gonzalo made possible a happy issue of the love episode, although it threatened to end with characteristic romantic fatality. What could be more romantic than the situation of Leonor and Gonzalo, the former engaged to a man she does not love, in love with a man of apparently humble birth; the latter discovering his noble origin only to believe he is his sweetheart's brother, and falling into the hands

---

[70] *Werner*, Act V, scene 1.

[71] Avellaneda, preface to *La verdad vence apariencias* in *Obras literarias*, Vol. 3, p. 438.

of his unscrupulous rival who casts him into a dungeon and plans to take his life? However, the fatal *dénouement* of romantic tragedy was avoided as it would have rendered impracticable Avellaneda's evident plan to work out her play according to a scheme of divine justice.

The drama is written entirely in *redondillas* and *versos de romance*. It was included in the *Colección completa* with many changes, none of which, however, affected the plot. In the original edition, scene 3 of Act I began with a long soliloquy of Rodrigo in which his jealousy is aroused by his finding in a prayer-book the following words in Leonor's handwriting:

> "¡Justo Dios! también os ruego
> por aquel desventurado
> que amé tanto, y que a despecho
> de la voluntad ¡Dios mío!
> en mi alma triste conservo."

After the soliloquy Don Álvaro enters and tells of a dream he has had in which he was urged to avenge the death of Don Tello. He also tells Rodrigo how he aided a fugitive soldier to escape from the castle on the night of the murder. In the final edition, scene 3 is a short soliloquy of Rodrigo of but nine lines. The finding of the prayer-book is omitted and in an entirely new scene (scene 4), Rodrigo becomes jealous through Leonor's indifference to him rather than through the discovery of any concrete evidence:

> ¡Miradme!
> ¿Mis ojos no están diciendo
> Que sin cesar buscan y hallan
> En vos los ardientes restos
> De un antiguo amor? Etc.

The motivation is more profound and thus the element of jealousy is greatly emphasized in the character of Rodrigo. The dream of Don Álvaro is omitted in the final edition and the dialogue between him and Rodrigo, in which he relates the events of the fatal night, is transferred almost verbatim to

scene 10, where it is more closely connected with the revelation of Gonzalo's identity.

Scene 9 of Act II of the original edition is a dialogue between Rodrigo and Don Álvaro in which the former obtains from the latter the order for Gonzalo's death. Don Álvaro suddenly repenting tries to snatch the order back again but Rodrigo hastens forth to have it executed. This scene is omitted for in scene 3 of Act II of the final edition, Rodrigo takes the matter in his own hands and will have Gonzalo disposed of under cover of darkness without awaiting an order from his father. This change, like the change we found in Act I shows a tendency from external to internal development of plot and character.

We find occasional changes of one or more lines made in order to improve bad verse. One such change often entails additional changes on account of the exigencies of rhyme or assonance. In scene 9 of the Prologue we find nine lines reduced to five with a great improvement in the verse:

Original edition	*Final edition*
ÁLVARO:	ÁLVARO:
y aquí ha de venir después ese hombre: ¡qué suerte atroz!	Y acá Lope se encamina.
GUERRERO:	GUERRERO:
¿Y es de don Tello esa voz?	Ningún recurso me queda Si no tenéis donde pueda Ocultarme.
ÁLVARO:	ÁLVARO:
No: la de su alcaide es: y *va a entr*ar, duda no queda.	¡Ah! me ilumina Súbito recuerdo . . . sí!
GUERRERO:	
Buen Beltrán, seré perdido si algún rincón escondido no tenéis en donde pueda ocultarme.	
ÁLVARO:	
¡Yo! . . . Ah! . . . sí! sí!	

Such changes as these show how conscientious Avellaneda was about the mere technique of her art.

Errores del corazón (1852)

Like *Leoncia*, *Errores del corazón* was written in prose and in a modern setting. It shows influences of that moral tendency in the theater which was to be developed later by Adelardo López de Ayala and by Manuel Tamayo y Baus, for it offers a definite preachment against that "positivismo material"[72] which is characterized as the "enfermedad de la época."[73] There is also a mild criticism of the unjustness of social conventions,[74] but these are minor issues, as the play is an exposition of Avellaneda's views on the question of love. It is a personal document, the theme of the *Autobiografía y cartas* dramatized.

First, we find an expression of idealistic love in the words of the Countess: "¡Ser amada es mi ambición! ¡amar con entusiasmo es mi dicha! . . . Viví para amar";[75] but this ambition, and this felicity are unattainable; María says, "por una fatalidad incomprensible jamás adivina el corazón cuál es el corazón que le comprende y puede hacerle feliz,"[76] and the Countess says, "los instintos del corazón a que prestamos tanta fé, suelen ser muy falsos y muy injustos."[77] These instincts only lead to *errores del corazón*. Nevertheless, there is such a thing as love; the Doctor says: "Existe el amor digno y durable; pero rara vez tiene su fundamento en el instinto ciego del corazón entusiasta. ¡Y no es una quimera la felicidad, no! pero siempre para poseerla es menester darla!"[78] To give happiness to others is "un poder divino . . . el goce supremo del mismo Dios."[79] This unselfish love is the love Avellaneda felt for Sabater, the love that inspired the *Cuartetos*;[80] and this dictum of the Doctor is the moral of the play.

---

[72] *Errores de corazón*, Act I, scene 3.
[73] *Ibid.*
[74] *Ibid.*, Act III, scene 11.
[75] *Ibid.*, Act I, scene 7.
[76] *Ibid.*, Act II, scene 3.
[77] *Ibid.*, Act III, scene 11.
[78] *Ibid.*
[79] *Ibid.*, Act III, scene 9.
[80] Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. I, p. 210: *Cuartetos al Excmo. Sr. don Pedro Sabater.*

In the Doctor's care for the sick Countess,[81] and again in Maria's care for the ailing Doctor,[82] there are reminiscences of Avellaneda's nursing of her dying husband.[83] The Doctor's decision to retire from his scientific pursuits to his estate in the country[84] recalls a similar intention expressed later by Avellaneda in a letter of March 26, 1854,[85] while his motives for this action remind us of the spirit of the first three strophes of the last poem of the edition of 1850 of Avellaneda's poetry, *El último acento de mi arpa;*[86] and finally, when the Doctor gives up the Countess, who does not love him but who is ready to sacrifice herself for his happiness,[87] we are reminded of Avellaneda's refusal to order Cepeda "to remain or to stay" as he requested her to do.[88]

The play is not included in the *Colección completa.*

Tres amores (1858)

Los tres amores is a further development of the theme of *Errores del corazón* with a clearer definition of terms resulting from a broader and a riper experience. This theme is human love, the principal manifestations of which the play attempts to reveal. The three different kinds of love are typified by the three chief characters—the hero Antonio represents the love of the heart, the heroine Matilde the love of the head, and the villain San Adrián the love of the senses.[89] In the end Matilde learns the same lesson the Doctor learned in *Errores del corazón*, the same lesson Avellaneda learned in life, that the love of the head is an illusion, but the love of the heart is holy and infinite, an attribute of the immortal soul; she joyfully gives up for Antonio her two newly acquired crowns, that of glory and genius, and that of birth and aristocracy, for Antonio is "un

---

[81] *Errores del corazón*, Act III, scene 9.
[82] *Ibid.*, Act III, scene 7.
[83] Cf. page 25 of this paper.
[84] *Errores de corazón*, Act II, scene 10.
[85] Avellaneda, *Autobiografía y cartas*, Madrid, 1914, p. 241.
[86] Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. I, p. 269.
[87] *Errores de corazón*, Act III, scene 9.
[88] Avellaneda, *Autobiografía y cartas*, Madrid, 1914, p. 226.
[89] *Los tres amores*, Act III, scene 9.

noble, más noble que todos nosotros . . . ¡Porque es de la raza que no conoce igual en la tierra! . . . ¡La de las grandes almas! ¡La raza cuyas ejecutorias ha escrito Dios!"[90] It might be said that *Los tres amores* illustrates Avellaneda's practical philosophy of life as *Baltasar* reveals her metaphysics.

As was the case with George Sand, Avellaneda's heart was ever her guide in philosophy. Like the great French novelist, she conceived the origin of love as divine and considered it as the leveller of all social classes.

Just as Avellaneda's literary ambition was often spurred by her love for Cepeda,[91] so Matilde's ambition for glory is inspired by her love for San Adrián: "El amor solo encendió mi ambición, y ser amada debe ser mi única recompensa"[92]; and just as Avellaneda cared for Sabater during his fatal sickness, so Matilde nurses Antonio through a dangerous illness.[93]

In many respects, moreover, Matilde is a reflection of Avellaneda's pride. After Matilde's success on the stage, she was hailed as the *Melpómene española*, a title Avellaneda was fond of hearing applied to herself.[94] When San Adrián explains to Matilde that one cannot be successful without acquiring enemies, as follows: "Cuando no se sabe, se inventa; y lo que inventa la maledicencia es . . . cien veces peor y más odioso que cuanto puede ejecutar realmente la fragilidad humana. . . . La celebridad tiene esos corolarios"; and yet, "cualquier género de gloria es prueba segura de que una vez, al menos, hemos vencido,"[95] we feel that Avellaneda is flaunting before the world the consolation that her genius afforded her for the insults of her own and her husband's various and sundry foes. The Barón de Baigorri is doubtless the Count Luis Sartorius while his protégé Cañuelo, the venal editor of the *Censor*,[96] is Cañete the editor of *El Heraldo* who wrote but four scornful lines on

---

[90] *Ibid.*

[91] Cf. Avellaneda's desire to have Cepeda witness the first performance of *Leoncia*; cf. *Autobiografía y cartas*, letters No. 24 and No. 25.

[92] *Los tres amores*, Act II, scene 3.

[93] Act II, scene 9.

[94] Cf. Aurelia Castillo de González, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

[95] Act II, scene 3.

[96] Act III, scene 4.

La hija de las flores in spite of the applause the comedy was receiving from the public.[97] Avellaneda wrote a very bitter letter to Sartorius complaining about Cañete's insolent neglect of her play, and advising him to bring the editor to account. However, the letter had no effect.[98] In a letter written to Cepeda in 1854, Avellaneda calls Sartorius her enemy;[99] the scene in question is a further confirmation of Pérez de Guzmán's statement that Avellaneda never excused Sartorius from the blame for her failure to become a member of the Spanish Academy.

It has been suggested that Antonio, who ever remains devoted to the great actress in spite of her indifference to him, is a portrayal of Avellaneda's brother Manuel.[100] It would be probably more exact to say that he is rather an idealization of her brother for Manuel's conduct toward his sister was not always fair and disinterested.[101] The character of Antonio has been criticized for the fine language he uses which is not in accord with his peasant origin and manners;[102] the criticism is irrelevant for Avellaneda never pretended to be a realist.

In scene 1 of Act II we have in the words of Matilde a glorification of arts and literature. They are the measure of a nation's success, and a monarch's glory. The theater never disappears among a people that still possesses vitality.

Like *Errores del corazón* the play is written in prose. It is divided into a prologue and three acts. The action takes place in the reign of Carlos III. The time of the three acts is five years later than that of the Prologue. The personages mention among their contemporaries Cadalso, Iriarte, Meléndez, Jovellanos and Nicolás Fernández de Moratín.

Avellaneda revised the play and included it in the *Colección completa*. She dropped the article "Los" from the title, and called the play a comedy whereas it was styled a drama in the original edition; and drama it is, for it is entirely devoid of comedy and the subject is treated throughout in a serious manner.

---

[97] Cf. Juan Pérez de Guzmán, *op. cit.*, p. 309.
[98] *Ibid.*, p. 310.
[99] *Autobiografía y cartas*, p. 243.
[100] Cf. Aurelia Castillo de González, *op. cit.*, p. 59.
[101] Cf. *Autobiografía y cartas*, p. 74.
[102] Cf. Aurelia Castillo de González, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

Cotarelo points out that the later edition is considerably changed and shortened, and that the character of Clara is entirely omitted.[103] The omission of the character of Clara is an insignificant change as she utters but six inconsequential words in the whole play. The important changes are the omissions of abrupt and irrelevant sentences and passages, the rearrangement and shortening of scenes in the second act, and the consequent general improvement in the dialogue. The remark of San Adrián, "Nos divide un abismo", in scene 16 of the Prologue is omitted in the final version; San Adrián might have thought this but would hardly have said it. Moreover, nothing is lost as the rest of his words reveal the situation in milder form: "Mi repentina ausencia es un bien para los dos; porque V. puede ser feliz con Antonio, y yo tengo necesidades que el cariño de V.—por grande que fuera—no satisfaría jamás." The remark of Antonio, "¡Qué bien le sienta ese peinado de Safo!" in scene 2 of Act I is likewise omitted; it does not fit well with Antonio's exalted admiration of Matilde. In scene 4 of Act II of the original version which corresponds in part with scene 3 of Act II of the final version, San Adrián says, "Nunca podré explicar toda la violencia del fuego que aquí arde, y seré muy desgraciado si Matilde no lo comprende ya. (¡Ese aparato de virtud es una coquetería deliciosa!)" This passage cleverly reveals the insincerity of San Adrián's character, but is unfortunately omitted in the later version. The final words of the play uttered by San Adrián: "¡Maldito el amor que me hizo despreciable a sus ojos!" and by Antonio: "¡Bendito el amor que me hizo digno de su alma!" are omitted; they are undramatic and weaken the force of the preceding words of Antonio and Matilde.

The Prologue and Act I have the same number of scenes respectively in both versions. Act II has ten scenes in the original version, and seven scenes in the final version, while Act III has nine scenes in the original version and ten scenes in the final version. In Act II, the length of the scenes is not only diminished but parts of one scene are shifted into another

---

[103] Cotarelo y Mori, *op. cit.*, *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, Vol. 2, p. 377.

and the dialogue is often inverted; all these changes seem to be in the interest of clearness and brevity.

The following passage from scene 1 of Act II is very interesting: "Los rasgos profundos de nacionalidad van desapareciendo: la civilización al difundirse semejará los pueblos unos a otros, y la literatura, reflejo exacto de las costumbres y de las ideas, presentará forzosamente menos matices. Pero el teatro no muere jamás en ningún pueblo que aun vive. ¡Cuando deje de reflejar las naciones, reflejará la humanidad! ¡el mundo!" Of this the only words that remain in the final version are: "el teatro no muere jamás en ningún pueblo que aun vive." The cosmopolitanism of the early passage was a fleeting point of view with Avellaneda, which on reflection, her deep-rooted nationalism would not admit.

The following words of the Barón de Baigorri in Act III, scene 4 were also omitted: "Nicolás Moratín me repite con frecuencia que no me oye vez que no se halle tentado a escogerme por tipo de una excelente comedia. Y yo le animo. Ya usted comprende. Siempre es gloria servir de tipo al talento . . . contemplarse uno . . . verse reproducido . . . en las tablas." This is doubtless the omitted passage which Cotarelo says caused a disagreeable incident at the first performance of the play and brought about its failure.[104]

Baltasar (1858)

Egilona dies predicting the triumph of Christianity over Islamism; the drama *Saúl* ends with the prediction of the coming of the kingdom of Christ; and the idea of the divine ministry of the Cross is the subject of *Recaredo;* in fact, we find in *Recaredo* Avellaneda's earliest concrete expression of this idea, viz.: in Act II, scene 14 where Recaredo says:

Nada podía
Dique oponer al ímpetu violento
De aquella turba indómita y bravía
Que hizo temblar a Europa en su cimiento;
Mas entre tanto escombro, se veía

[104] *Ibid.*

Del suplicio de Cristo el instrumento. . . .
¡El sólo allí quedó . . . y él fué bastante
Para domar al bárbaro triunfante!

It was on the basis of a similar thought that Avellaneda conceived and wrote her *Baltasar*. She was probably not satisfied that *Saúl* was sufficiently free from the imitation of its obvious models, and although she was convinced that the biblical play was a *genre* destined to unpopularity,[105] she again turned to the Bible for material. The "great philosophic thought" that inspired her is as old as Christianity itself. It is the conception that the successive civilizations of the ancient world arose and fell for the divine purpose of preparing a way for Christianity, and that the advent of Christianity effected a reversal of pagan ethical values, raising woman and the slave to equality with the highest elements of society.[106] This idea of the rise and fall of nations is found in almost equal terms in the third part of Bossuet's *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*, which was directed to the Dauphin just as Avellaneda's dedication was addressed to the Prince of Asturias; but it is not until Chateaubriand that we find Bossuet's conception rectified to conform with the new ideas of progress and freedom engendered by the eighteenth century.[107]

Now with Chateaubriand there arose also a new artistic point of view—the idea of the superiority of Christianity over pagan mythology as material for the poet; the theory of the *Génie du Christianisme* exemplified by *Les Martyrs;* and the same year that the *Génie* appeared (1802), Baour-Lormian, the famous interpreter of *Ossian* and the *Jerusalem Delivered*, published in the *Almanach des Muses* a poem, *Le Rétablissement du Culte*, which gave expression to the new viewpoint. It begins as follows:

---

[105] Cf. the autobiographical article in *La Ilustración*, Madrid, November *3, 1850.*

[106] Avellaneda, *Dedicatoria* of *Baltasar.* Also *Baltasar*, Act IV, scene 3, speech of Daniel to Baltasar.

[107] Cf. Chateaubriand, especially *Etudes historiques*, premier discours, in *Œuvres Complètes de Chateaubriand*, Paris, 1859–61, Vol. 9, pp. 106–107.

Que Pindare, autrefois, sur une lyre impie,
Ait chanté pour ses dieux aux fêtes d'Olympie,
Je n' emprunterai point ses profanes accords!
Mais toi qui du Cédron fis retentir les bords,
Qui charmas du Liban les cèdres solitaires,
Viens résonner encor sous mes mains téméraires,
Harpe du roi prophète, etc.

With this same inspiration, Baour-Lormian wrote his tragedy, *Omasis ou Joseph en Egypte*, which was first played September 14, 1806. It ends with the following words of Joseph to his father Jacob:

Ce Dieu, qui pour vos fils réserve son appui,
Doit à leurs bras vainqueurs confier son tonnerre,
Et jeter à leurs pieds tous les rois de la terre.

In 1822, the two Gascons, Alexandre Guiraud and Alexander Soumet, each produced a biblical play. Guiraud's tragedy, *Les Machabées*, was played on the 14th of June. In the speech of Ephraim (the eldest of the seven brothers) to Antiochus (Act II, scene 6), we find a definite statement of Bossuet's teaching:

Crois-tu, toi, dont le cœur ne sait que tes faux dieux,
Que le Dieu d'Israël soit fait à leur exemple?
Tu penses l'accabler des débris de son temple . . .
Son temple est l'univers dans son immensité;
Son encens, un cœur pur de sa flamme excité.
Son trône est dans les cieux dominateur des trônes.
C'est de là qu'au hasard il jette les couronnes;
Quelquefois leur attache un lustre éblouissant,
Ou sur le front des rois les écrase en passant.
A tous les potentats qu'arma notre défense
Il ouvrit les trésors de sa munificence;
Cyrus nous protégea; tu sais quel fut Cyrus,
Tous les peuples, les rois devant lui disparus.

Less than five months later, Soumet's *Saül* was played (the 9th of November). Although his favorite reading was Kant,

Klopstock, Milton and the Bible, especially the Prophets,[108] this is the only biblical play Soumet produced. However, his other work is important for us because it is the direct outgrowth of Chateaubriand's esthetic doctrines; this is particularly true of *Une fête de Néron*, 1829, and *Le Gladiateur*, 1841, the latter of which was ostensibly written to reveal the glories of Christian martyrdom and the evils of Roman slavery. Yet although Soumet was called a philosophic poet whose chief aim was to lay bare the vices of ancient societies,[109] we cannot help feeling that he, like his predecessor, was more delighted with the esthetic beauties of his subject than convinced by its moral teaching.

On the 18th of April, 1843, Mme. Emile de Girardin, (Delphine Gay), presented at the Théâtre-Français her tragedy, *Judith*, the story of the undoing of Nebuchadnezzar's greatest general by a woman. The play was written largely to create a rôle for Mlle. Rachel.[110] Two years later, May 8, 1844, Lefèvre's adaptation of Byron's *Sardanapalus* was played at the Odéon, and more than two years after this, September 8, 1846, *Le Temple de Salomon*, a spectacular biblical drama in prose by Auguste Anicet-Bourgeois and Adolphe Dennery, was produced at the Théâtre de la Gaîté.

Biblical subjects also found favor in grand opera. Baour-Lormian's *Omasis* was the basis of Alexandre Duval's libretto for Méhul's opera *Joseph* (1807). Rossini's *Mosè in Egitto* was first played in 1818; Francesco Basili's *Sansone* in 1824; Generali's *Voto di Jefte* in 1827; Verdi's *Nabucco* in 1842; Litta's *Sardanapalo*, and Levi's *Giuditta* in 1844. In 1846, Mallefille used Soumet's *Saül* for his libretto for Mermet's opera *David*. Another *Nabucco* was produced by Pinto, at Lisbon, in 1850, and Mabellini produced a *Baldassare* in Florence in 1852. Along with these operas there were many oratorios, several, in particular, dealing with the subjects of Athalia and Esther. This

---

[108] Cf. Joseph Dedieu, *Alexandre Soumet* in *Revue des Pyrénées*, Toulouse, Vol. XXV, 1913, p. 35.

[109] Cf. Hippolyte Lucas, *Histoire philosophique et littéraire du théâtre français depuis son origine jusqu' à nos jours*, Paris, 1843, p. 335.

[110] Cf. Théophile Gautier, *Histoire de l'Art Dramatique en France*, Paris, 1859, 3d series, p. 45

brief review of biblical plays and biblical operas gives but a faint idea of the tremendous success on the stage of the *merveilleux chrétien* in the first half of the nineteenth century.

The story of *Baltasar* is as follows: The courtier, Rabsares, eager to win favor with the King by providing a means to relieve his ennui, interests the King's mother, Nitocris, in the fate of the beautiful Hebrew captive Elda, in order to have her released from a dungeon and brought before the King. With Elda, the niece of the prophet Daniel, are imprisoned the blind and aged Joaquin, the former King of Judea, and his grandson Ruben. Elda and Ruben are lovers and loath to separate. Elda is brought before Baltasar and being asked to sing, refuses. He orders her to be taken to the harem; Ruben comes to her defense; he is disarmed but Baltasar magnanimously sets him free. The Babylonian monarch is now truly in love with the Hebrew slave. He issues a decree ordering that a new god, the god of the Hebrews, be added to the list of those the Babylonians worship. The people resent this new decree and rise up against the Jews, but Baltasar declares that he intends that Elda shall be his Queen. It is then that Ruben declares that he is betrothed to Elda. To get revenge for his discomfiture, Baltasar hands Ruben over to the angry crowd which tears him to pieces while Elda is lead back to her prison. The monarch wishes once more to seek forgetfulness in feasting. The licentious merriment is interrupted by the reappearance of Elda who in her madness thinks she is in the midst of a cemetery. As she is carried away the feast continues. Baltasar orders the sacred vessels of the temple of Solomon brought forth, and as he and the courtiers are about to drink a toast to the God of Jacob, the hall is suddenly enveloped in darkness; on the wall midst flashes of lightning the fatal words appear: "Mane, Thecel, Phares." The wise men confess their inability to interpret the legend. Daniel explains it as the prediction of the triumph of Cyrus over the kingdoms of Babylonia. He is confirmed by Rabsares, who on entering states that the Persians have already arrived at the gates of the city. Baltasar goes forth to fight, and is brought back wounded. Uttering words of faith in the

one and only God he dies in the arms of his mother, Nitocris. She sets fire to the palace, the Persians triumph, and Daniel declares that Cyrus has been chosen by God to erect the new temple which will hear the voice of the Messiah.

The story of Belshazzar's feast is found in Chapter V of the Book of Daniel. Here we read of the drinking from the sacred vessels, the handwriting on the wall, the wise men's failure to interpret it, Daniel's version of the mystic words, the death of Belshazzar, and the triumph of the Medes and Persians. Cyrus' successful penetration into Babylon by means of the arrangement devised by Nitocris for directing the course of the river into ornamental lakes, as referred to in scene 1 of Act II, and in scene 10 of Act IV, although having no source in the Bible, is told by Herodotus, whom Bossuet quotes as his source for the same narrative in his chapter *Les Assyriens anciens et nouveaux, Les Mèdes, et Cyrus.*[111]

To the story of Belshazzar's ruin, it was necessary to add the episode of the humble Hebrew lovers in order to fulfill the requirements of Avellaneda's thesis. Just as Mme. de Girardin's *Judith* had been written for Rachel, so the actor, Paolo Giacometti, wrote a *Giuditta* for Rachel's rival for glory, La Ristori.[112] This was one of the tragedies of La Ristori's repertory on her trip to Madrid in the latter part of 1857.[113] In Mme. de Girardin's *Judith*, Holophernes, wearied of glory, finds happiness in the love of a woman; in scene 2 of Act II, he says:

> Une femme, pour moi, ce n'était qu'une esclave;
> L'amour . . . un vain pouvoir qui plaît ou que l'on brave.
> Quelle est donc cette ardeur que je ne puis dompter?

And in scene 6 of the same act:

> La gloire! . . . . . .
> Son bonheur est amer, son ivresse est cruelle;
> Par ses vaines grandeurs on n'est point corrigé . . .
> Mais j'aime . . . et par l'amour tout mon cœur est changé.

---

[111] Bossuet, *op. cit.*, troisième partie, Chapter IV.

[112] Cf. Adelaide Ristori, *An Autobiography*, Boston, 1888, p. 52.

[113] Cf. C. Navarro y Rodrigo, article on *Baltasar* published in the newspaper *La Época* of April 12, 1858, and included in Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 5, pp. 332–342. Hartzenbusch published an article on Giacometti's play in *Las Novedades* of October 25, 1857, which I have not been able to consult; cf. *Bibliografía de Hartzenbusch* published by his son, D. Eugenio de Hartzenbusch, Madrid, 1900.

Baltasar likewise is tired of glory; when Nitocris urges: "La gloria eternal . . .," he replies: "¡Es humo!" and further:

¿Y qué es un solio? ¿Qué son
su pompa y brillo fulgente,
si no remontan la mente
ni dan vida al corazón?

—Act II, scene 4.

Like Holophernes, he feels transformed by the love for what he scorned:

¡Una mujer y un esclavo
me han resistido! . . . . .
. . . . . .
¡Siento un placer inefable
al comprender que amar puedo, etc.

—Act III, scene 2.

When the camp rises in protest against Judith, Holophernes says:

je veux qu'ici même, à l'instant,
On rende à cette femme un hommage éclatant,
Oui! . . . je veux, pour venger cette injure mortelle,
Voir tous ces insolents prosternés devant elle;
Je veux qu'ils viennent tous, honteux, humiliés,
Déposer en tremblant leurs armes à ses pieds;
Je veux que dans mon camp et dans toute l'Asie,
On adore à genoux celle que j'ai choisie! . . .

—Act II, scene 6.

and offers to worship the God of the Jews:

Je servirai ton Dieu, s'il permet que tu m'aimes;

—Act II, scene 9.

Likewise, Baltasar will have the Hebrew God adored:

¡Yo ordeno
que el Dios de mi bella esclava
con vuestros dioses caldeos
se asocie desde este día!

—Act III, scene 3.

and orders the disaffected people to bow before the one he loves:

¡Que el pueblo penetre aquí!
¡Que a tus pies se postre
y en una virgen judía
a mi regia esposa adore!
—Act III, scene 7.

Giacometti's Holophernes is not so wearied of glory as he is tired of the protracted warfare he is obliged to wage in this particular case; he exclaims:

E guerra è questa
Che combatte Oloferne? Un ozio lungo,
Tedio, torpore egli è.
—Act III, scene 1.

And Judith is not merely a woman, a slave who has awakened his love, he feels rather that she is his destiny:

La mia stella è Giuditta
è il genio mio.
—Act III, scene 1.

la stella
Che guidarmi dovea . . .
—Act III, scene 5.

Moreover, Holophernes is not willing to worship the Hebrew God; Judith must choose between God and him:

Scerre tu devi
Fra due Numi, o Giuditta!
—Act III, scene 5.

On the other hand, just as the high priest, Eliakim, refuses to kneel before Holophernes:

al Dio d'Abramo
Solo mi prostro,
—Act III, scene 7.

so Elda refuses to bow down before Baltasar:

> Las gentes de mi creencia
> sólo de Dios a presencia
> deben doblar las rodillas.
>
> —Act II, scene 4.

And just as Eliakim, who has stepped in between Holophernes and Judith, cries out to the tyrant: "uccidimi!" (Act III, scene 7), so Ruben, who has rushed forth to save Elda from Baltasar's attack, exclaims: "¡mátame!" (Act II, scene 7). Furthermore, just as Judith begs Holophernes to spare Eliakim: "Chieggo grazia[114] per lui!" (Act III, scene 7), so Elda implores Baltasar to have mercy on Ruben: "Sé piadoso, señor, pues eres fuerte" (Act II, scene 6). However, it would seem that Avellaneda was more profoundly influenced by the more classical play of Mme. de Girardin. It is true that there is a riotous banquet scene in Giacometti's play which does not occur in the plot of Mme. de Girardin, but the banquet scene in *Baltasar* was original in the Book of Daniel and in no way resembles that of Giacometti's play.

Baltasar is weary of more than glory; when Nitocris asks him what he is suffering from, his answer is: "¡La existencia!" (Act II, scene 4.) This is the *mal du siècle*, which in spite of its universality rarely attained such full expression in the theater. We find it in *Le Temple de Salomon*, 1846 (Anicet-Bourgeois-Dennery), where the King exclaims: "Néant des vanités humaines! . . . Toute ma grandeur, toute ma puissance tombent et s'évanouissent devant un seul mot: l'ennui."—(Act I, scene 3).

And we might imagine that this romantic Solomon was the direct prototype and model for Baltasar, if we did not find the same spirit in Avellaneda's lyric poetry. The sonnet *Mi mal*,[115] written in 1841 ends as follows:

---

[114] The text reads *graziar*.

[115] This poem is the last one of the edition of 1841 and is found unchanged in the *Obras literarias*, Vol. 1, p. 112.

Pero es un mal terrible, sin remedio,
Que hace odiosa la vida, odioso el mundo,
Que seca el corazón . . . En fin, es tedio!

Baltasar is Avellaneda herself, first the victim of inexplicable ennui, then of unrequited love, at last finding peace in divine grace. It is true that Avellaneda first sought forgetfulness in artistic pursuits, but the palliative of esthetic contemplation that Schopenhauer found to mitigate his gloom did not long suffice her. Always devout, she now turned entirely to religion for comfort, not as a mystic but as a repentant sinner in search of consolation;[116] and so she obtained this consolation, not by divine communion but through a philosophy of religion inspired by the hope of a life beyond the grave. Baltasar is pardoned and redeemed as he dies. In this redemption is found the only cure for his ennui. Without this "otherworldliness"[117] the "great philosophic thought"[118] on which the play is based would lose its meaning. It is curious to find in a poem written at Seville, in 1839, to Cepeda, a more concrete, although less philosophic, expression of the same conception:

Acaso en esa tumba
do juntos bajaremos,
un destello gocemos
de lumbre celestial.
Acaso un genio aguarda
nuestras almas dolientes
para abrirles las fuentes
del placer eternal.[119]

Saúl, because of the great amount it owes to Soumet's play, is the offspring of Chateaubriand's esthetic doctrines. *Baltasar* as the original product of Avellaneda's genius, is the genuine outgrowth of full-blown romanticism. Moreover, as the expression of a philosophic thought it is again distinguished from

---

[116] Cf. Valera, *Florilegio de poesías castellanas del siglo XIX*, Madrid, 1903, Vol. 5, p. 328.
[117] Blanco García calls this, "nostalgia del cielo"; cf., *op. cit.* p. 193.
[118] Avellaneda, *Dedicatoria* of *Baltasar*.
[119] Avellaneda, *Autobiografía y cartas*, p. 89.

Saúl; and in this it gives evidence of a new influence. Before 1850 the theater did not deal with moral issues; after 1850 the moral lesson was the chief concern; the highest dramatic beauty was inseparable from the highest moral excellence. In 1851, in his preface to *Un Hombre de Estado*, López de Ayala says: "He procurado en este ensayo y procuraré en cuanto salga de mi pluma, desarrollar un pensamiento moral, profundo y consolador." In 1855, our own authoress complains in the *Prólogo* to her comedy, *Los oráculos de Talía*, that the critics failed to find in her play "ni pensamiento filosófico, ni fin moral." In *Baltasar* she made sure that there would be no mistake about the moral issue, and this is the great difference between her play and Byron's *Sardanapalus*.[120] It was said that she used Byron's play as her model. Most of the critics who have written on *Baltasar* deny this relationship without, however, making a very careful comparison of the two plays.[121] Blanco García admits the probability of influence.[122] Valera points out the vast differences in the plays and in the characters of Sardanapalus and Baltasar.[123] But there are also many similarities. The hero of both plays is an Oriental monarch; both monarchs are neglecting their realms and are being conspired against by treacherous satraps. Both are effeminate, peace-loving voluptuaries, and both are advised to cast off their sloth, Sardanapalus by his brother-in-law Salemenes, Baltasar by his mother Nitocris:

SAL: Thy sires have been revered as gods.

SAR: In dust
And death, where they are neither gods nor men.
—*Sardanapalus*, Act I, scene 2.

NIT: tus preclaros ascendientes,
se hicieron armipotentes
y eternizaron sus nombres.

BALT: ¡Los hizo dioses el mundo
a par que polvo la muerte!
Baltasar, Act II, scene 4.

[120] Juan Valera, *Observaciones sobre el drama titulado Baltasar*, article published in *El Diario Español* of April, 1858, and included in Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 5, pp. 353–365; cf. p. 365.

[121] *Ibid.*, pp. 357, 358; C. Navarro y Rodrigo in Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 5, p. 341; Pedro Antonio de Alarcón, *ibid.*, p. 321, and Menéndez y Pelayo, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1, p. 267.

[122] Francisco Blanco García, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

[123] Valera, *op. cit.*, pp. 360, 361.

Both Salemenes and Nitocris believe in the inherent courage of the monarch:

SAL:

In his effeminate heart
There is a careless courage which corruption
Has not all quenched and latent energies,
Repressed by circumstance, but not destroyed.

—*Sardanapalus*, Act I, scene 1.

NIT:

No se postra por flaqueza
Del rey el ánimo grande;
Duerme su alma, no está muerta.

—*Baltasar*, Act II, scene 1.

And on being disillusioned, they give up the ring which was the token of their power (*Sardanapalus*, Act II, scene 1; *Baltasar*, Act IV, scene 1). As Sardanapalus drinks to the Greek god Bacchus to the horror of Salemenes (Act I, scene 2), so Baltasar toasts the God of the Hebrews to the consternation of Nitocris (Act IV, scene 8). The main scene of both plays is a banquet hall. Both plays end with the firing of a palace and the ruin of an empire.[124] In view of these parallels and considering that Avellaneda had translated some of Byron's lyric poetry and used a play of his as material for one of her dramas (*La verdad vence apariencias*), it seems quite probable that *Sardanapalus* may have suggested to her the subject of *Baltasar*.[125]

Baltasar is pervaded by the spirit of the Bible and is rich in biblical imagery. Many of the lyrical passages are excellent translations from the Old Testament, particularly the Psalms and Lamentations.

The play is written in the following verse-forms: *versos de romance*, *redondillas*, *cuartetos*, *silvas*, and a sixteen line hymn in an irregular verse of seven syllables in scene 4 of Act II.

Avellaneda made only a few changes to *Baltasar* in the *Colección completa*. Unlike *Munio Alfonso*, *El Príncipe de Viana* and *Saúl*, *Baltasar* was the product of maturity. Not more than

---

[124] Some of these similarities are pointed out by the Mexican critic, Ignacio M. Altamirano in an article, *Ensayo crítico sobre Baltasar*, published in the *Revista de Cuba*, Havana, 1880, Vol. VII; cf., pp. 374–376.

[125] Ignacio M. Altamirano comes to a somewhat similar conclusion; "Tal vez no sea temerario asegurar que la señora Avellaneda se inspiró en esa bellísima producción del genio poderoso de Byron," *op. cit.*, p. 376."

ten years had elapsed between the writing of *Baltasar* and the final edition of the dramas, while almost twice that length of time had passed since the first performance of *Saúl*, and an even longer time since the first versions of *Munio Alfonso* and *El Príncipe de Viana*.

We find a few changes to improve the verse, as in scene 1 of Act I, where—

> ¡De ese cuadro la amargura
> grabada en *mi* alma siento!

is changed to—

> ¡De ese cuadro la amargura
> grabada en *el* alma siento!

in order to avoid the unpleasant hiatus.

The only important change is in scene 12 of Act IV: Baltasar has just acknowledged the God of the Jews and dies in the arms of Nitocris. In the edition of 1858 Nitocris says, "¡Mi bien!" and Joaquin exclaims, "¡Su fin es glorioso!"; then Nitocris utters the closing remarks of the scene. In the edition of 1869, Nitocris is silent; Joaquin exclaims, "¡Ah!" and Daniel says, "¡Tal fin borre su vida!" whereupon Nitocris' words complete the scene. The later arrangement is much more dramatic and Daniel's remark more pregnant than the equivalent words of Joaquin in the early version. "Su fin es glorioso" could be said of a saint as well as of the sinful Baltasar; "Tal fin borre su vida" not only reveals the glory of his death but also contrasts this death with his sinful life. The concluding words of Nitocris were also changed, as may be seen below:

Edition of 1858	Edition of 1869
El no existe, y esas voces	No existe ya: y esas voces,
nos anuncian que feroces	que lanzan turbas feroces,
llegan en triunfo ominoso	me anuncian que está invadida
los indignos vencedores	por ellas nuestra mansión;
¡mas no hollarán sus despojos	mas no hollarán sus despojos,
profanando ante mis ojos	ni han de contemplar mis ojos
la mansión de mis mayores!	del cetro asirio el baldón.

The substitution of "ya" for "él" makes a great improvement in the meaning, and the thought of Nitocris gains considerable emphasis by the stress on "cetro asirio" instead of "mis mayores."

Catilina (1869)

The last drama Avellaneda wrote was *Catilina*, an adaptation of a play of the same name written by Alexandre Dumas *père* with the collaboration of the historian, Auguste Maquet, and produced for the first time at the Théâtre Historique on the 14th of October, 1848. Crébillon had written a *Catilina* (1748), and the conspiracy of Catiline was the subject of Voltaire's *Rome sauvée* (1752). The *Catilina* of Dumas and Maquet was written in prose in seven "tableaux," that is, a prologue, five acts and an epilogue.

The chief characters of Dumas' play are Catiline, Marcia, Aurelia Orestilla, Fulvia and Charinus. Catiline has ravished Marcia, the priestess of Vesta, who was later thought to be buried alive along with her illegitimate offspring. Many years later Catiline discovers that Marcia is still living and that Charinus is his son. Catiline is defeated in the elections for consul through the machinations of Fulvia. He is now dependent on the financial resources of the rich and profligate Aurelia Orestilla to carry out his seditious plans, but Aurelia is jealous of Catiline's love for his son. Catiline gathers the conspirators together at his home where they swear mutual allegiance, drinking from vessels filled with human blood. Catiline learns that the blood was that of his son Charinus slain by Aurelia. He leaves the city and prepares for the attack against the army of the republic; but his own army is defeated and he dies on the field of battle.

Sallust tells us that Catiline had been guilty of criminal connections with a priestess of Vesta,[126] that he slew a son by a former marriage in order to marry Aurelia Orestilla who objected

[126] Sallust, *Conspiracy of Catiline*, Chapter XV.

to having a step-son,[127] that Fulvia had conveyed information against Catiline to Cicero who used the information to prejudice public sentiment in his favor,[128] and that Catiline and his accomplices, drinking from goblets filled with human blood, took an oath of allegiance to each other.[129]

The immediate guilt of Aurelia in the death of Catiline's son, the character and rôle of Charinus, and the means adopted by Fulvia in bringing about Catiline's defeat in the elections are all inventions of the dramatists. The notion that the blood drunk by the conspirators was that of Catiline's own son, was probably suggested by Thyeste drinking the blood of his son Plisthène from a vessel proffered by Atrée, in scene 6 of Act V of Crébillon's *Atrée et Thyeste* (1707).

Avellaneda employed verse in her adaptation and reduced the original to four acts with many changes in characters and plot. Marcia, the priestess, becomes Aurelia the faithful wife of Catiline. Fulvia, Catiline's mistress, is based partly on Dumas' Fulvia, and partly on Aurelia Orestilla. Carino is the legitimate son of Catiline and Aurelia. Thus the episode of the ravishment of the priestess is omitted. Catiline is defeated in the elections by Fulvia who, in this respect, is the Fulvia of Dumas' play, and the original Fulvia of history; but Fulvia, as the mistress of Catiline, is jealous of Aurelia as well as of the boy Carino; in this respect she is Aurelia Orestilla of Dumas' play. The episode of the drinking of blood is omitted, but Carino is captured and slain by Fulvia through the same ruse employed by Aurelia Orestilla in the play of Dumas and Maquet.

The violation of the priestess and the drinking of human blood are not the only elements Avellaneda omitted. Dumas' play is rich in minute historical details which are doubtless the product of Auguste Maquet's intimate acquaintance with Roman history.[130] Many of these are omitted by Avellaneda along with other purely fictitious elements such as the funeral

---

[127] *Ibid.*

[128] *Ibid.*, Chapter XXIII.

[129] *Ibid.*, Chapter XXII.

[130] Cf. Hippolyte Parigot, *Le Drame d'Alexandre Dumas, étude dramatique, sociale et littéraire*, Paris, 1898, p. 235.

scene in the prologue, Catiline's hurling the disk of Remus into the Tiber in the first act, the details of the voting in the fourth act, the mysterious appearance of Aurelia Orestilla disguised as Nemesis in the fifth act, etc.

In spite of the historical setting, Dumas' drama anticipates in many ways the work of Augier and of Dumas *fils*,[131] the ethical issues and the emotional states are quite modern. Charinus is an illegitimate child, but Catiline turns out to be the kind-hearted father. Aurelia Orestilla's attachment to Catiline is a *grande passion:* "Je n'aime point Catilina comme on aime un homme . . . je l'aime comme on aime sa propriété. Je vous veux exclusivement, entièrement . . . vous me donnez le droit de disposer souverainement de tout et de tous";[132] Aurelia then becomes jealous of Catiline's son, but in Avellaneda's play Fulvia's jealousy is rather that of a mistress who sees her lover slipping from her and returning to his lawful spouse. Parigot thinks that Dumas' play could have been entitled equally well *Quinze ans après, ou le fils de la religieuse;*[133] but this title could in no way be applied to Avellaneda's play.

Moreover, the unification of Aurelia Orestilla and Fulvia into one character, viz., Fulvia, made possible a simpler and clearer motivation of the action that led to Catiline's downfall.

Thus we see that Avellaneda by omitting many of the historical details of the original play, by lessening the moral and emotional tone, and by simplifying in a general way the plot and characters, has treated the subject in a classical manner; but this is not surprising in her adaptation of another author's work, when we find the same tendency in the recasting of her own plays.

Although large parts of Dumas' play were translated, Avellaneda displayed a great deal of originality in her choice and use of the original elements. She also added several scenes of her own invention (scenes 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of Act III) in which she draws abundantly from Cicero's *First Oration against Catiline.*

---

[131] *Ibid.*, p. 239.
[132] Act II, scene 9.
[133] *Op. cit.*, p. 240.

These recall in a general way the scenes between Cicero and Catiline in Act IV of Voltaire's *Rome sauvée*, but a comparison of the two plays shows that Voltaire's tragedy had no influence whatever on the work of Avellaneda.

The play is written in the following verse-forms: *versos de romance*, *redondillas*, *romances heroicos* and *cuartetos*. It was first printed in Seville in 1869 and in the same year was included in the *Colección completa*.

III

COMEDIES

La hija de las flores (1852)

La hija de las flores, o todos están locos was Avellaneda's most successful comedy. It was received with the warmest enthusiasm and was later translated into French, English and Portuguese.[1]

Aurelia Castillo de González hazards the suggestion that the character of Flora, the daughter of the flowers, is based on Yolande in the French play which Avellaneda translated a few years later under the title of *La hija del rey René;* but in the same breath, this fond and admiring biographer, refrains from drawing any conclusion in the matter because Avellaneda herself never alluded to the similarity.[2] However, we dare not overlook this similarity. In scene 2 of Lemoine's *La fille du roy René*, the Prince cries out: "J'aperçus ces riants jardins, etc., une jeune fille endormie! ou plutôt un ange! . . . une fée! un bouquet de bruyère était dans ses mains . . . Je m'en emparai." In *La hija de las flores* Luis likewise meets the mysterious Flora who gives him a flower (Act I, scene 5), and later he exclaims:

> ¡Este es un mundo de encantos!
> que estoy soñando imagino:
> ¿Quién es el ser peregrino
> que envuelve prodigios tantos?
>
> —Act I, scene 8.

There is, furthermore, a great resemblance in the naïveté of both characters; both have been reared close to nature and know

[1] Cf. E. Cotarelo, *op. cit.*, p. 374. It would be interesting to know who translated it into French and English, and when and where (if at all) it was performed in those languages.

[2] Aurelia Castillo de González, *op. cit.*, pp. 47, 48.

nothing of the outside world; neither has heard of love before, and although their origin is quite different, neither knows who her parents were. But here the likeness ceases. Flora is not blind like Yolande, and in her tripping movements and sudden appearances and disappearances, there is something of the unreal and ethereal of Shakespeare's Ariel. Flora's identification with flowers recalls the early poems of José Selgas y Carrasco written in 1849. In Selgas' poem, *Amor del poeta*, we find the fanciful picture of Laura:

> Pálida es su hermosura,
> Pero es la palidez de la azucena.
> En su talle gentil halló la rosa
> La casta languidez con que se mueve, etc.

She is so sympathetically related to nature that:

> Ríen las flores al mirarlas ella;
> Y con su dulce armonía
> La fuente gime cuando Laura llora.

Virtue and modesty are her attributes:

> Su corazón es puro;
> Como su corazón su pensamiento.

Her habitation is:

> Por la verde pradera,
> Por la margen del río,
> Cuando la tarde tímida y ligera
> Llueve sobre las flores su rocío.

And if she suddenly appears, she also suddenly vanishes:

> Si a mis inquietos ojos comparece,
> Su blanca mano me señala el cielo,
> Y rápida otra vez desaparece.

All of which is true of Flora; Juan says that the flowers gave birth to her, and she feels so intimately at one with their being that in referring to them she frequently uses the first person plural.

She does not know whether she is a woman or a flower. Once upon a time she became ill and the whole garden became gloomy and sad. She too is modest and her heart is pure and innocent. She lives among the flowers and sleeps in the garden as on a mother's bosom. She appears and disappears like a fairy or a goddess of the wood.[3] There is this difference, however; Laura is an abstraction—virtue, the poet's inspiration—while Flora is a person, the character of a play. The same intimate feeling between flowers and a human being is revealed in Selgas' poem, *La flor de la maravilla*. La Flor de la Maravilla is a shepherdess of whom it is said:

> Todas las flores la miran,
> Porque inocentes la adoran;
> Y si ella canta, suspiran,
> Pero cuando llora, lloran.

In *Lo que son las mariposas*, flowers speak to each other; in *La alondra*, birds and flowers speak, and in *La adelfa*, Selgas himself addresses the flowers: "Flores, prestadme oído, etc." In *Las dos camelias* and again in *Lo que son las mariposas*, flowers are referred to as one another's sisters. Likewise, Flora refers to the lily as "nuestra hermana."[4] Furthermore, it is quite probable that the poem, *La inocencia la virtud*, may have suggested Flora's song:

> Bellos los años son, bella es la vida
> En aquella feliz edad de flores
> En sueños de inocencia adormecida; etc.
>
> Bella es la vida,
> Bella es la flor, etc.

In the poem, *El amor y el olvido*, we find the very name of Flora, but she is here the goddess of the flowers and not a human being, and the poem is allegorical.[5]

In view of all these similarities, there can be no doubt about

---

[3] Cf. Act I, scenes 5 and 6.

[4] Act II, scene 4.

[5] All the poems of Selgas quoted or referred to above were written in 1849, and are found in Vol. 1 of the *Poesías* of José Selgas, Madrid, 1882. The title of this volume is *La primavera y el estío*.

Avellaneda's debt to Selgas. For her too flowers represent virtues:

> Violeta, rosa, azucena,
> Juntitas habéis de estar;
> Que forman bello conjunto
> Candor, modestia y beldad.
>
> —Act I, scene 5.

Yet she made of Flora a human being, and thus her originality consisted in combining Selgas' abstraction representing virtue, innocence, etc., with Lemoine's character of Yolande, and in making of the result the personage of a drama. She thus produced, as Aramburo y Machado says, "A completely new type that had never before been presented on the stage."[6]

Cotarelo thinks that *Leoncia* was never played in Madrid because Avellaneda used it for material for other plays,[7] and there is, indeed, a reminiscence of *Leoncia* in the plot of *La hija de las flores*. In *Leoncia*, Carlos is in love with a woman who proves to be the mother of the girl to whom he is betrothed; in *La hija de las flores* Luis is betrothed to a woman who proves to be the mother of the girl with whom he falls in love. As was the case with Leoncia, the life of Inés has been made unhappy by the abandonment of a faithless lover. In both plays this faithless lover is the father of the hero. The main differences are that Carlos is in love with the mother while Luis is in love with the daughter, that Carlos is his sweetheart's half-brother, while Luis is merely his sweetheart's cousin, and that the one play ends in tragedy while the other ends with happiness for all.

The comedy is written in the following verse-forms: *versos de romance*, *redondillas*, *quintillas*, 9 and 10 syllable *octavillas italianas*, *letrillas*, and in scene 5 of Act I an irregular rhymed verse in two, four, five and six syllables; the length of the line and the consonantal rhyme are not arranged according to any system.

---

[6] M. Aramburo y Machado, *La Avellaneda, su personalidad literaria*, 2d edition, Madrid, 1898, p. 150.

[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 365.

A second edition of the comedy was published in 1859 without any alterations. Both editions were dedicated to Zorrilla. This dedication was suppressed in Volume 3 of the *Colección completa* where the play is found with a few minor changes and omissions. The parts omitted are really unessential for the development of the plot. The only noteworthy omission is that of scene 7 of Act II between the Baron and Luis. This scene is well written and contains good comedy; it was dropped unquestionably to hasten the action of the play. Scene 8 of this act is divided into two scenes in the later version; the first part between Inés and Beatriz, being numbered 7, and taking the place of the scene that was omitted; the second part, from the point where the Count and Baron appear being numbered 8. Thus, the rest of the scenes of this act as well as all the scenes of the other acts are numbered the same as in the original. It is interesting to note that the lyrical elements, particularly the irregular verse and the *octavillas italianas* in scene 5 of Act I, remained unchanged.

La Aventurera (1853)

La Aventurera is an adaptation of Emile Augier's *L'Aventurière.* Augier's play was first performed at the Théâtre de la République on the 23d of March, 1848. It is written in alexandrine verse and is divided into five acts. In 1857 Augier recasted it into four acts along with other minor changes. This revised version was published and played in Paris in 1860. However, it is with the version of 1848 that we are concerned, as Avellaneda's play was produced in 1853.

The scene is laid in Padua in the seventeenth century. The characters are the adventuress Doña Clorinda, her brother Don Annibal, the wealthy old burgher Mucarade, his son Fabrice, his brother Piquendaire, his daughter Célie and Piquendaire's son Horace, betrothed to Célie. The play is a combination of three elements: first, the *drame bourgeois*, in the action between Clorinda, Mucarade and Fabrice;[8] second, the *comédie picaresque*,

[8] Cf. A. Rambeau, *Augier's "L'Aventurière" of 1848 and 1860, The Modern Language Quarterly*, 1902, Vol. 5, p. 132.

in the character of Annibal and to some extent in the character of Fabrice;[9] third, the traditional French rôles of the youthful lover and the *ingénue* which have persisted in French comedy since the time of Molière.[10]

Avellaneda reduced this play to four acts and gave it a Spanish setting. The action takes place at Seville some time after the liberation of Mexico (1821). The names of the characters are all changed. Doña Clorinda becomes Natalia; Don Annibal becomes El Marqués; Mucarade becomes Don Julian; Fabrice becomes Eduardo; Célie becomes Luisa, and Horace becomes Carlos. The character of Piquendaire is omitted, but a letter from Don Julian's brother, whose name is not given, is read and commented upon by Don Julian in scene 2 of Act I, and thus replaces this rather unimportant rôle.

The stories of both plays are very similar and much of the original has been translated by Avellaneda. The statement made by D. Antonio Romero Ortiz that the plays are absolutely different from each other[11] can only be explained as a result of Sr. Ortiz's ignorance of the work of Augier. It is important, however, to note the changes Avellaneda made. In Augier's play Clorinda's past is revealed to Mucarade by Fabrice; in Avellaneda's play, Natalia of her own accord tells Don Julian the unsavory story of her life. In Augier's play Fabrice again accomplishes a reconciliation between Clorinda and Mucarade; in Avellaneda's play this reconciliation is brought about spontaneously by Don Julian. Scene 6 of Act III of Augier's play is a scene between Clorinda and Célie in which the pure maiden mercilessly repulses the sinful *courtisane*. The effect of this repulse is to make Clorinda fall into the trap of the elopement proposed by Fabrice. Avellaneda translated this scene (scene 8 of Act II of her version), but Luisa's repulse has the quite different effect of making Natalia more resolute in her intention to marry Luisa's father, Don Julian. In Augier's play Mucarade overhears Clorinda and Fabrice speaking of the

---

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 142.

[11] Antonio Romero Ortiz, *Juicio crítico del drama La Aventurera*, article published in *La Nación* of June 7, 1853, and edited in Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 5; *loc. cit.*, p. 311.

elopement and thus he is finally disillusioned. In Avellaneda's play Natalia will not elope with Eduardo in spite of his insistence and although she is in love with him; Don Julian is not disillusioned with respect to Natalia but the latter renounces their proposed marriage of her own accord. The episode of the duel is also changed. In Augier's play Fabrice puts Annibal to flight when he accepts the latter's challenge in earnest. In Avellaneda's play the duel is fought between the third and fourth acts and the Marqués is wounded. The most important change is in the conclusion of the play. In Augier's play, Clorinda repents of her past life and goes away; the love of Célie and Horace again becomes possible, and Fabrice exclaims to Mucarade:

> Que de petits-enfants notre maison fourmille!
> Mon père, nous serons les vieux de la famille.

In Avellaneda's play Don Julian exclaims to Luisa and Carlos:

> Casaos, sí . . . que yo os vea
> Felices, siempre a mi lado.

To which Eduardo adds:

> y su dulce unión, en vez
> de la otra—que sueño ha sido—
> le guarda un nieto querido,
> apoyo de su vejez.

But this is not the end. Eduardo and Natalia have both repented, and now Eduardo explains that Natalia has decided to retire to a convent in order to atone for her sinful life, and that he, having understood:

> Que es enorme sinrazón
> que la ley de expiación
> sólo alcance a la mujer;
> y que el hombre, juez severo
> del mismo mal que ocasiona
> corrompiendo halle corona,
> y la halle al ser justiciero;

has decided to go forth to expiate his sins by serving humanity.

The three elements we found Augier's play to consist of are all discovered again in Avellaneda's version; but there is a fourth element in the latter not found in the former. Whereas Augier's play ends like a *drame bourgeois* with the glorification of peaceful family life, Avellaneda's play ends with the expiation of the two sinful and unhappy characters, Natalia and Eduardo. This fourth element, the expiation, was original with Avellaneda and is quite characteristic. Eduardo's atonement recalls that of Munio Alfonso, and that of Rodrigo in *La verdad vence apariencias*. However there is this difference. Munio's mission was a national one, so was Rodrigo's; they were both enjoined by a superior authority. The mission of Eduardo is taken up in defense of humanity, and voluntarily. Natalia's atonement recalls Avellaneda's oft-expressed desire to retire to a convent herself.

The play is written in the following verse-forms: *redondillas*, *versos de romance* and *cuartetos*. It was included in the *Colección completa* with several changes and a few omissions. Most of the changes affect the character of Natalia, making her less corrupt than in the earlier version just as in this version she was less corrupt than Augier's Clorinda. In scene 5 of Act I, Natalia urging Don Julian to sing, deceitfully complains:

> No escucho
> tres días ha su voz sonora,
> cantarme aquellas playeras
> tan lindas, tan deliciosas.

In the revised version, this remark is put in the mouth of the wily Marqués, while Natalia thus expresses her disgust:

> (¡Qué burla odiosa!)

Again in scene 7 of Act II where Eduardo tries to urge Natalia to elope with him—in the original edition this scene ends when Natalia says: "Señor duque, adiós." In the revised edition, instead of this farewell, Natalia says: ("¡Qué terrible tentación!") This new remark stresses her moral struggle and thus

emphasizes the virtue of her subsequent decision. Scene 9 of Act II is a soliloquy of Natalia. The wording is considerably changed in the later version. In the early edition Natalia's pride is dominant:

> mi altivez
> no ha de ser nunca abatida . . .

Whereas in the later version, the chief motive in her decision seems to be the desire to show society the unfairness of its judgments:

> Yo haré al mundo que sienta
> De su fallo la injusticia.

Sometimes words are changed for more suitable ones, as in the following *redondilla* in scene 8 of Act II:

NATAL:	
¡Sal! . . . y jamás, *niña impía*,	¡Sal! . . . y jamás, *mujer fiera*,
Tu aliento corra en mi ambiente!	Tu aliento corra en mi ambiente!
LUISA:	
Señora, hay muro imponente	Señora, hay muro imponente
Entre su esfera y la mía.	Entre su esfera y mi esfera.
—Ed. of 1853.	—Ed. of 1870.

Natalia does not look upon Luisa as a child but rather as a woman who represents a class innately hostile to her own. Hence, the change to *mujer fiera* conforms more strictly to the spirit of the dialogue.

The last scene of Act III, (scene 11) is omitted, and a footnote in the original edition indicates that it was also omitted in the performance of the play. Eduardo and the Marqués have gone forth to fight a duel. Luisa enters, and Natalia tells her what has happened and urges her to plead with her father to stop the duel. This is absurd enough for Natalia herself seems to have more influence with Don Julian than Luisa. The scene ends with Natalia on her knees and Luisa with arms outstretched to heaven, both praying to the Virgin to preserve the life of Eduardo. These fervent prayers seem out of place

in a comedy, and this is probably why the scene was omitted in the performance.[12]

Finally, in the last scene of the play there is another significant omission. This is the remark of Eduardo quoted above:

> y su dulce unión, en vez
> de la otra—que sueño ha sido—
> le guarda un nieto querido,
> apoyo de su vejez;

which is a paraphrase of Augier's—

> Que de petits-enfants notre maison fourmille!

The remark of Don Julian—

> Casaos, sí . . . que yo os vea
> Felices, siempre a mi lado—

is still retained, but the above omission unquestionably weakens the force of the *drame bourgeois* element. A foot-note tells us that this omission was also made in the performance of the play. Avellaneda was evidently willing to sacrifice other elements in order to lay the greatest possible stress on the expiatory conclusion. In the same scene the above-quoted *redondilla* in Eduardo's closing remarks is changed as follows with a great improvement in the sense:

Y que el hombre, juez severo	Y que el hombre, juez severo
del mismo mal que ocasiona	de faltas de que es autor,
corrompiendo halle corona,	blasone de seductor
y la halle al ser justiciero. (1853)	y después de justiciero. (1870)

Between 1853, the year of the first performance of *La Aventurera*, and 1870, the date of Volume 3 of the *Colección completa*, including the revised version of *La Aventurera*, Augier had revised his *Aventurière*.[13] There is no evidence, however, that Avellaneda's recasting was affected by this revision; we rather find the difference in spirit between Augier's play and her play

[12] This conclusion would not be contrary to the reason alleged in the above-mentioned foot-note, which states that the scene was omitted "por exigirlo así la conveniencia escénica."

[13] Cf. *Avertissement* to revised edition of *L'Aventurière*, dated May 2, 1860.

more pronounced in the later version. It is quite probable she knew nothing of Augier's new edition.

La hija del rey René (1855)

The one-act comedy, *La hija del rey René*, is merely a free translation into *redondillas* and *versos de romance* of Gustave Lemoine's prose paraphrase of a play written by the Danish dramatist, Henrik Hertz. Hertz's play was first produced at Copenhagen in 1845, and Lemoine's version was first played in Paris, at the Théâtre du Gymnase, December 28, 1850. It was published in Paris the following year.

Yolanda, the daughter of King René of Provence, was born blind. In order that she might never realize her affliction, she has been kept in seclusion in a charming garden remote from the rest of the world, where she is not allowed to hear any words descriptive of objects of vision. An Arabian physician offers to try to cure Yolanda's blindness, but cannot guarantee success. King René is not willing to risk his daughter's happiness. Meanwhile, the Prince of Vaudemont enters the garden and falls in love with Yolanda; addressing her, he uses such words as "white," "red," "beautiful," etc., and thus Yolanda learns of her misfortune. The Arabian physician now takes it upon himself to attempt a cure. His efforts are successful and King René rejoices in giving the hand of his daughter to the Prince.

We have already pointed out the great probability that Lemoine's play inspired the character of Flora in *La hija de las flores*.[14] The subject appealed to Avellaneda's poetic and idealistic nature. In her dedication of the play to the actress, Josefa Palma de Romea, who took the rôle of Yolanda, she complains of the "época de prosaísmo y de mal gusto que estamos atravesando." Such unfortunate conditions she doubtless hoped to regenerate through the production of works of this type.

She simply indicates that her play is adapted from the French without mentioning the author. As a matter of fact, it is a translation, and her only just claim to originality is the smoothly

[14] Cf. pp. 95 and 98 of this paper.

flowing verse, which has been highly praised by all who have criticized the play. Aurelia Castillo de González exclaims: "¡Qué versos! los únicos que podían esmaltar con diáfanos matices el finísimo dibujo de tan primorosa miniatura"[15]; and Avellaneda was obviously so well satisfied with the verse that she included the play in the *Colección completa* without any alterations. However, the words quoted above from the dedication were omitted in the *Colección completa* and the dedication was considerably shortened.

Simpatía y antipatía (1855)

One of the elements in the plot of *La hija de las flores* was the union of a couple after long years of separation. This is the subject of the one-act comedy, *Simpatía y antipatía*, but here the couple are already married. The marriage was entered into simply to gratify the desires of an aged guardian of the bride and groom. The latter was represented by a proxy and ever after the wedding was indefatigable in his efforts to obtain a divorce. En route to Rome for this purpose he meets his wife; they do not recognize each other and fall in love. Avellaneda probably got this plot from *La Fausse Antipathie* (1733), a three-act comedy in verse by Nivelle de la Chaussée.

The play threatens to become a defense of divorce; the question is raised very frankly; Isabel says in scene 5:

> Un enlace
> que ha sancionado la Iglesia,
> sólo termina en la tumba.

To which the Count replies:

> Ese enlace Dios reprueba,
> que entre seres que se odian
> no hay unión ni pudo haberla.

But we undoubtedly have Avellaneda's final judgment in the matter in Isabel's decision in scene 10:

> Si libre quedo, otro esposo
> tendré . . . pero será Cristo.

[15] *Op. cit.*, p. 52.

In many of the words of Isabel we again find Avellaneda's pessimistic views on love and happiness; *e. g.*, in scene 5:

> Venturosos los que encuentran
> de la vida en los umbrales
> al ser que a su ser completa.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Pero esas almas hermanas
> vagar por rutas diversas
> suelen en el triste mundo
> y nunca o muy tarde llegan
> a hallarse, Conde.[16]

The play is written in *redondillas* and *versos de romance.* It was not included in the *Colección completa.*

Los oráculos de Talía, o los duendes en palacio (1855)

The rise of Valenzuela during the latter part of the minority of Charles II is the subject of *Los oráculos de Talía, o los duendes en palacio.* The play was written to satirize the awarding of public office without due consideration for the aptitudes of the candidate. Valenzuela, at first a starving poet, becomes so involved in court intrigue that he finally stakes all on political triumph. The satire was obviously suggested by Avellaneda's experiences in failing to obtain Gallego's seat in the Spanish Academy.

The story adheres fairly well to the facts of history.[17] The personality of Valenzuela is, however, Avellaneda's own invention. The Valenzuela of history was, indeed, somewhat of a poet. Probably with the hope of attaining an easier way of approach to the Queen, he married one of her attendants, Doña Eugenia, and soon became a sort of spy for her Majesty, secretly informing her of the designs and movements of John of Austria and his accomplices. It is thus that he was nicknamed the Queen's *duende.* He was generally considered to be her lover, and was quickly advanced to the rank of grandee with the title

---

[16] Cf. remark of María in *Errores del corazón,* quoted on page 73 of this paper.

[17] Cf. John Dunlop, *Memoirs of Spain during the reigns of Philip IV and Charles II from 1621 to 1700,* Edinburgh, 1834, Vol. 2, Chapter 4: *Rise and Fall of Valenzuela.*

of Marquis of Villa Sierra. Later, with the success of John of Austria, he fled, but was caught behind a secret panel in the convent of the Escorial.

Avellaneda makes of Valenzuela a naïve and kindly poet, a sort of Don Quijote; his Sancho Panza is his servant Valentín. Through a panel in the wall of Valenzuela's room, Doña Eugenia overhears the conversations of courtiers who come to use the poet as a tool in the furtherance of the cause of John of Austria. She falls in love with him, and talking from behind a statue of Thalia predicts a great future for his genius. This talking statue recalls the enchanted head in Chapter LXII, Second Part, of Don Quijote.[18] It is through Doña Eugenia that Valenzuela is brought before the Queen. Avellaneda stresses the love episode between Valenzuela and Eugenia and thus saves the honor of the Queen. The *duende* of the play is Doña Eugenia. However, with the Queen's honor saved and with Valenzuela largely deprived of his attributes of *duende*, it is hard to explain his sudden rise to power through the favor of the Queen.

Avellaneda was criticized by some for apotheosizing Valenzuela; by others for making a simpleton of him.[19] She wished to confound the hostile critics by showing their mutual contradictions, but these very contradictions were the faithful reflection of inconsistencies in the play itself. For does not the impractical poetaster of the first two acts become the melancholy lover in the fourth act, and the magnanimous and triumphant statesman in the fifth?

The comedy is written in *redondillas* and *versos de romance;* only a few unimportant changes in words and phrases are noted in the version of the *Colección completa.*

El millonario y la maleta (1870)

El millonario y la maleta is a two-act farce in prose. It was written for a theater of amateurs but never performed, and

---

[18] For other examples of similar devices giving forth oracles, see Francisco Rodríguez Marín, *edición crítica* of *Don Quijote*, Madrid, 1917, Vol. 6, p. 262, note to line 6.

[19] Avellaneda, *Prólogo* to *Los oráculos de Talía* in *Obras literarias*, Vol. 3, p. 205.

was first edited in the *Colección completa* (Volume 3, 1870). It is the only play in the manner of Bretón that Avellaneda wrote and has been compared with Molière's *Les Précieuses ridicules*.[20] It is, indeed, true that the character of Mónica is a *précieuse* reminding one, moreover, in her vain attempt to display a knowledge of Latin, of other characters of Molière, notably Sganarelle in *Le Médecin malgré lui*. Besides being a satire on the problem of marriageable daughters and small town life, the play contains certain picaresque elements, particularly in the rôle of Doña Cayetana. The love of Gabriela for the artist Emilio recalls the love of Matilde for the poet San Adrián in *Tres amores*, but Gabriela's love is more truly requited than that of Matilde. The plot is very improbable but the comedy is well sustained, and the play is interesting as an example of what Avellaneda could do in this *genre*.

[20] Cf. Aurelia Castillo de González, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

IV

VERSIFICATION OF THE PLAYS

Avellaneda's early plays in verse resemble the tragedies of Quintana in the fact that one verse form is used throughout and that this verse form is the *romance heroico*.[1] This is the metre of *Munio Alfonso*, *El Príncipe de Viana*, *Egilona*, and of *Saúl* except for the songs and prayers, etc. These exceptions do not indicate any change in Avellaneda's conception of dramatic art, for they are mere lyrical appendages to the essential body of the drama. Moreover, Soumet's play also departed in the case of the songs and hymns from the classical alexandrine, and in this it had no less authoritative a model than *Athalie*. It is interesting to observe that during the very years these plays were being produced, Avellaneda was composing lyric poetry in which she was constantly reviving metrical combinations that had fallen into disuse, modifying others and even inventing new ones.[2]

With *Recaredo* there is a considerable change in Avellaneda's conception of dramatic art; the severity of the previous plays has yielded to a kindlier though less heroic ideal, and this change is reflected in the verse. Various forms are used: besides the *romance heroico* we find *versos de romance*, *redondillas*, *quintillas*, *octavas reales*, and an unusual nine syllable *romance* in *a aguda*. This irregularity only occurs in the first sixteen lines of the play and Avellaneda never reverts to it again. Even here in the midst of such diversity she did not reach the extreme of using *versos sueltos* or prose; and there are fewer metrical variations than in most of the plays of the romanticists.

We do not find the *romance heroico* again until *Catilina* and here it is used along with *cuartetos*, *silvas*, *versos de romance*

---

[1] Cf. also the classical tragedies of Martínez de la Rosa (e. g., *La viuda de Padilla*), and of the Duque de Rivas (e. g., *Lanuza*).

[2] Cf. Regino E. Boti, *La Avellaneda como metrificadora*, *Cuba Contemporánea*, Havana, December, 1913, Vol. 3, p. 389.

and *redondillas*. The last two forms are the exclusive metres of *La verdad vence apariencias* and the predominant metres of all the comedies. *La hija del rey René*, *Simpatía y antipatía* and *Los oráculos de Talía* are written entirely in these two forms. This is true of *La Aventurera* except for one scene in *cuartetos*, and of *La hija de las flores* except for a few *quintillas*, *octavillas italianas* and the irregular verse of a short song which does not form part of the plot. In thus favoring *versos de romance* and *redondillas*, Avellaneda was simply following the traditional custom of all Spanish writers of comedy, both classical and romantic.

The fact that she always adhered to conventional forms of verse in her dramas is very significant; for it shows that her severe conception of dramatic art was in no way influenced by the tendency to invent new metres which is displayed in the development of the versification of her lyrics, and in which, it has been said, she was a harbinger of modern free verse.[3]

Avellaneda's dramatic verse is poor in figurative speech; the few figures that are found are of the most conventional type. The poetry of this verse consists in the heroic tone of the narrative passages, the high coloring of the descriptive passages and the personal note of the lyrical passages. This triple excellence reveals Avellaneda's understanding of the *justo medio* of her time and her interpretation of it by a well-balanced eclecticism.

Conclusion

The basic influence in Avellaneda's dramas was Quintana. This influence is most effective in the heroic roles in *Munio Alfonso*, *El Príncipe de Viana* and *Egilona*. However, we find in these early plays two new elements which have an interesting development in the later plays. First, the idea of expiation found in *Munio Alfonso*, which was most probably suggested to Avellaneda by the original story of the chroniclers; second,

---

[3] José M. Chacón y Calvo, *Tabla de variantes en las poesías líricas de la Avellaneda*, dated Madrid, March, 1919, but published in *Obras de Avellaneda, edición nacional del centenario*, Havana, 1914, Vol. 6, p. 284.

the conception of the generous prince in Carlos of Viana and Abdalasis, which was doubtless Avellaneda's own idealization of manhood.[4]

We have found the above-mentioned method of expiation applied again in *La verdad vence apariencias*, and later without its nationalistic limitations, in the comedy *La Aventurera*. The second element, however, that of the generous prince, has a more profound and significant development. The unorthodox Abdalasis who worships

> aquel Dios sin nombre, ni figura,
> mas fuerte, sabio, poderoso, inmenso,
> que no reclama de los hombres culto,
> ni altar exige, ni demanda templo, etc.[5]—

makes way for Recaredo, the defender of the Faith, and it is not until the *Dedicatoria* of *Baltasar* that we find expressed the motive for this change, for here Avellaneda says, "He querido pintar en él (*i. e.*, Baltasar) lo poco que es la más grande alma cuando no la ilumina la fe ni la fecunda el amor, etc."; Baltasar is another Abdalasis but in the end an Abdalasis converted and redeemed.

At the same time the heroic tone of the early plays has entirely disappeared in *Baltasar*. In *Egilona* Rodrigo defiantly shouts to Abdalasis:

> Lo que he perdido
> sólo de mi constancia y de mi arrojo
> depende recobrar.[6]

While in *Baltasar* the humble Joaquín entreats:

> ¡Nada en el mundo deseo
> como mis hijos me otorgues!
> Con ellos me das la dicha,
> y sus pasados dolores
> olvida el pecho.[7]

---

[4] Cf. *Autobiografía y cartas*, p. 45.
[5] Act III, *cuadro* 2, scene 4.
[6] Act I, scene 7.
[7] Act III, scene 6.

Thus the influence of *Pelayo* imminent in *Munio Alfonso* and *Egilona* gives way in *Baltasar* to the force of the now fully developed ideal of the generous prince, who in this the last stage of his development requires a future life for the completion of his destiny.

Religion had now become the dominant influence in Avellaneda's life and works, but her religion was not the esthetic religion of Chateaubriand; neither was it the dogmatic religion of Donoso Cortés. It was rather a religion of comfort for one who had become "disgustada de la realidad de la vida."[8] The following words from a letter to Cepeda furnish the key to an understanding of the psychological basis of Avellaneda's religion: "Marchita mi alma a fuerza de desilusiones, aún se siente con fuerzas para amar, y no atreviéndose a enlazarse con otra acá en la tierra, siento que ansía desprenderse de su cárcel e ir a buscar en el cielo una fuente de eterno amor."[9] To which she adds, "Esto me da placer, porque jamás me siento tan infeliz como cuando, en momentos de desaliento, creo que estoy destinada a sobrevivir a mi corazón".[10] Andhere at the very source of Avellaneda's religiosity, we find the most convincing confirmation of Menéndez y Pelayo's pointed observation: "Lo femenino eterno es lo que ella ha expresado, y es lo característico de su arte, etc."[11] It was the eternal feminine seeking artistic expression for its ideal that produced the plays and culminated in *Baltasar* and not the spirit of proselytism defending a creed, as Valera insinuated.[12]

---

[8] *La Illustración*, Madrid, November 3, 1850. Many similar expressions are quite frequent in the *Autobiografía y cartas*.

[9] *Autobiografía y cartas*, p. 155.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de la poesía hispano-americana*, Madrid, 1911, Vol. 1, p. 265.

[12] D. Juan Valera, *Observaciones sobre el drama titulado Baltasar*, in Avellaneda, *Obras literarias*, Vol. 5, p. 362. Valera almost in the same breath gave himself the lie, admitting that Avellaneda was too much of a poet to use the drama to defend a thesis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIOGRAPHICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Nicomedes Pastor Díaz, *Noticia biográfica de la Excma. Sra. Da. Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda de Sabater*, and the *Adición a los anteriores apuntes* signed E. G. (thought to be Enrique Gil), both of which articles are to be found in Volume 1 of the *Obras literarias de la Señora doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, Colección completa*, Madrid, 1869–71; *Autobiografía y cartas de la ilustre poetisa Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda*, edited by Lorenzo Cruz de Fuentes, 2d edition, Madrid, 1914; the first edition was published at Huelva, 1907, and they were also published in three instalments in *Cuba contemporánea* of January, February and March, 1914, under the title *Cartas amatorias de la Avellaneda;* and again in the *Obras de Avellaneda, Edición nacional del centenario*, Havana, 1914; *Doña Gertrudis Gómez Avellaneda de Savater, Apuntes biográficos* (Avellaneda's own notes written in the first person), in *La Ilustración* of D. Angel Fernández de los Ríos, Madrid, Saturday, November 3, 1850; *Memorias inéditas de la Avellaneda* anotadas por Domingo Figarola-Caneda, Havana, 1914; José Augusto Escoto, *Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, Cartas inéditas y documentos relativos a su vida en Cuba de 1859 a 1864*, Matanzas, 1912; *Cuatro cartas inéditas de la Avellaneda*, published by C. Eguía Ruiz in *Razón y Fe*, Madrid, November, 1918; Aurelia Castillo de González, *Biografía de Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda y juicio crítico de sus obras*, Havana, 1887; M. Aramburo y Machado, *La Avellaneda, su personalidad literaria*, 2d edition, Madrid, 1898; Aurelio Mitjáns, *Historia de la literatura cubana*, Madrid, 1918; José A. Rodríguez García, *de la Avellaneda, Colección de artículos*, Havana, 1914; E. Cotarelo y Mori, *Examen de libros, Doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, Indicaciones bibliográficas con motivo de un libro reciente*, (Rodríguez García, *op. cit.*), in *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, Volume 2, Madrid, 1915; Pedro José Guiteras, *Poetisas cubanas; Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda*, in *Revista de Cuba*, Havana, 1877, Volume 2, not Volume 3 as quoted in José Rodríguez García, *op. cit.*, p. 155; Francisco Calcagno, *Diccionario Biográfico Cubano*, New York, 1878; José Domingo Cortés, *Diccionario Biográfico Americano*, Paris, 1875; D. Manuel Ovilo y Otero, *Manual de biografía y de bibliografía de los escritores españoles del siglo XIX*, Paris, 1859; Juan Pedro Criado y Domínguez, *Literatas españolas del siglo XIX, apuntes bibliográficos*, Madrid, 1889; *Diccionario universal de Historia y Geografía*, Madrid, 1846, edited by D. Francisco de Paula Mellado; Cotarelo y Mori, *op. cit.*, p. 363 suggests that Rodríguez García in *op. cit.* might have added this dictionary to his list; but Rodríguez García does mention (p. 333) a *Diccionario universal de Historia y Geografía*, Mexico, 1853, which as a matter of fact is based on Mellado's and in which the article on Avellaneda is the same verbatim; Cotarelo, *op. cit.*, p. 363, note 1, thinks the article autobiographical; Baronesa de Wilson, *El Mundo Literario Americano*,

Barcelona, 1903, Volume 1; Juan Pérez de Guzmán, *La sucesión de D. Juan Nicasio Gallego en la Real Academia Española*, in two articles in *La Ilustración Española y Americana*, No. XLII of November 15, 1906, and No. XLIII of November 22, 1906.

WORKS CONTAINING CRITICISM OF AVELLANEDA'S PLAYS
OMITTING THOSE INCLUDED IN THE BIOGRAPHICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de la poesía hispano-americana*, Madrid, 1911, Volume 1; P. Francisco Blanco García, *La literatura española en el siglo XIX*, 2d edition, Madrid, 1899, parte primera; Enrique Piñeyro, *El Romanticismo en España*, Paris, 1904; Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *Historia de la literatura española*, Madrid, 1921; Julio Cejador y Frauca, *Historia de la lengua y literatura castellana*, Madrid, 1917, Volume VII; Hurtado and González Palencia, *Historia de la literatura española*, Madrid, 1921; José María Chacón y Calvo, *Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, las influencias castellanas, examen negativo*, Havana, 1914; Salvador Salazar, *Milanés, Luaces y la Avellaneda como poetas dramáticos*, Havana, 1916; Ignacio M. Altamirano, *Ensayo crítico sobre Baltasar*, in *Revista de Cuba*, Havana, 1880, Volume VII; Emilio Blanchet, *Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda como poetisa lírica y dramática*, in *Revista de la facultad de letras y ciencias* of the University of Havana, March, 1914, Volume XVIII, No. 2; Blanche Zacharie Baralt, *Gertrude Gomez de Avellaneda, the Cuban Poetess as a Great Dramatist*, in *Werner's Magazine*, New York, 1898; Various articles in Volume 5 of the *Colección completa*, found also with additional articles in Volume 6 of the *Edición nacional del centenario*.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF AVELLANEDA'S PLAYS

Alfonso Munio. Tragedia en cuatro actos por la Señorita de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1844.

El príncipe de Viana. Drama trágico en cuatro actos por la Señorita de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1844.

Egilona. Drama trágico en tres actos y cuatro cuadros por la Señorita de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1845.

Saúl. Tragedia bíblica en cuatro actos por la Excma. Señora doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda de Sabater, Madrid, 1849.

Flavio Recaredo. Drama en tres actos y en variedad de metros por la Excma. Señora doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1851.

La verdad vence apariencias. Drama en verso, en dos actos y un prólogo por la Excma. Señora doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1852.

Errores del corazón. Drama en tres actos y en prosa, por la Excma. Señora doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda de Sabater, Madrid, 1852.

La hija de la flores, o todos están locos. Drama en tres actos y en verso, por la Excma. Señora doña G. Gómez de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1852. Second edition, Madrid, 1859.

El donativo del diablo. Drama en tres actos y en prosa por la Excma. Sra. doña G. Gómez de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1852.

La Aventurera. Drama en cuatro actos y en verso, imitación de la comedia francesa de igual título y en cinco actos, por la Excma. Sra. doña G. Gómez de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1853.

La hija del rey René. Drama en un acto, arreglado del francés y puesto en verso castellano por la Excma. Sra. doña G. G. de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1855.

Simpatía y antipatía. Comedia en un acto, por la Excma. Sra. doña G. G. de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1855.

Oráculos de Talía, o los duendes de palacio. Comedia en cinco actos y en verso, por la Excma. Señora doña G. G. de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1855.

Baltasar. Drama oriental en cuatro actos y en verso, original de la Señora doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1858. Second edition, Madrid, 1858.

Los tres amores. Drama en tres actos precedidos de un prólogo, original de la Señora doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1858.

Obras literarias de la Señora doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda. Colección completa, Madrid, 1869, 70, 71. Volumes 2 and 3 contain all the dramatic works that were retained. Volume 2 is dated 1869; Volume 3, 1870. The plays in Volume 2 are: *Munio Alfonso, El Príncipe de Viana, Recaredo, Saúl, Baltasar,* and *Catilina.* The plays in Volume 3 are: *La hija de las flores, o todos estan locos, La Aventurera, Oráculos de Talía, o los duendes en palacio, La hija del rey René, El millonario y la maleta, La verdad vence apariencias,* and *Tres amores.* The new plays appearing in these two volumes are *Catilina* and *El millonario y la maleta. Catilina* is described as "Drama en cuatro actos y en verso—Refundición y arreglo al castellano del escrito en frances y en prosa, con igual título, por los señores Dumas y Maquet." *El millonario y la maleta* is described as "Pieza cómica en dos actos y en prosa."

Obras de Avellaneda, edición nacional del centenario, Havana, 1914. Volumes 2 and 3 contain all the dramatic works contained in Volumes 2 and 3 of the *Colección completa* plus *Leoncia, Egilona* and *El donativo del diablo.*

Leoncia. Drama inédito de doña Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, Madrid, 1917.

Publications of the University of Pennsylvania

Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures

1. THE LIFE AND WORKS OF CRISTOBAL SUÁREZ DE FIGUEROA. By J. P. Wickersham Crawford, Ph.D. 1907. Price $1.50.
2. WAS FERNANDO DE HERRERA A GREEK SCHOLAR? By R. M. Beach, Ph.D. 1908. Price $1.00.
3. FRANCISCO DE LA CUEVA Y SILVA. TRAJEDIA DE NARCISO. By J. P. Wickersham Crawford, Ph.D. 1909. (Out of print.)
4. THE LIFE AND WORKS OF CRISTÓBAL DE CASTILLEJO, THE LAST OF THE NATIONALISTS IN CASTILIAN POETRY. By Clara Leonora Nicolay, Ph.D. 1910. Price $1.50.
5. LA ESPAÑOLA DE FLORENCIA (O BURLAS VERAS, Y AMOR INVENCIONERO) COMEDIA FAMOSA DE CALDERÓN DE LA BARCA. By S. L. Millard Rosenberg, Ph.D. 1911. Price $2.00.
6. THE LITERARY RELATIONS BETWEEN LA FONTAINE AND THE "ASTRÉE" OF HONORÉ D'URFÉ. By Walther P. Fischer, Ph.D. 1913. Price $1.50.
7. DIÁLOGO DE LA VIDA DE LOS PAJES DE PALACIO BY DIEGO DE HERMOSILLA. Edited by Donald Mackenzie, Ph.D. 1916. Price $2.00.
8. THE EARLY ENTREMÉS IN SPAIN: THE RISE OF A DRAMATIC FORM. By William Shaffer Jack, Ph.D. 1923. Price $2.00.
9. THE SOURCES OF THE POETRY OF GUTIERRE DE CETINA. By Alfred Miles Withers, Ph.D. 1923. Price $1.50.
10. THE CORRESPONDENCE OF PHYSICAL AND MATERIAL FACTORS WITH CHARACTER IN BALZAC. By Gilbert Malcolm Fess, Ph.D. 1924. Price $1.50.
11. THE LIFE AND DRAMATIC WORKS OF GERTRUDIS GÓMEZ DE AVELLANEDA. By Edwin Bucher Williams, Ph.D. 1924. Price $2.00.

EXTRA SERIES

1. THE SPANISH PASTORAL ROMANCES. By Hugo A. Rennert, Ph.D. 1912. Price $2.00.
2. LAS BURLAS VERAS. COMEDIA FAMOSA DE LOPE DE VEGA CARPIO. By S. L. Millard Rosenberg, Ph.D. 1912. Price $1.50.
3. FARÇA A MANERA DE TRAGEDIA. Edited by Hugo A. Rennert, Ph.D. Valladolid, 1914. Price $1.00.
4. THE SPANISH PASTORAL DRAMA. By J. P. Wickersham Crawford, Ph.D. 1915. Price $1.50.
5. COMEDIA FAMOSA DE LAS BURLAS VERAS DE IVLIAN DE ARMENDARIZ. By S. L. Millard Rosenberg, Ph.D. 1917. Price $1.50.
6. THE DIALECTS OF CENTRAL ITALY. By Herbert H. Vaughan, Ph.D. 1916. Price $1.50.
7. SPANISH DRAMA BEFORE LOPE DE VEGA. By J. P. Wickersham Crawford, Ph.D. 1922. Price $2.00.

Copies may be obtained by addressing

Department of Romanic Languages
College Hall, University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

PRINTED BY
WESTBROOK PUBLISHING CO.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.